

# DEFEATING EURABIA

FJORDMAN



# DEFEATING EURABIA

FJORDMAN

## Table of Contents

The Eurabia Code.....	5
The Eurabia Code — 2008 Updates.....	27
The Muslim Brotherhood’s Infiltration of the West.....	32
The Organization of the Islamic Conference and Eurabia .....	37
Ten Reasons to Get Rid of the European Union.....	43
The EU and the Globalist Alliance .....	53
The Immigration Tsunami, Part 2 .....	60
Stupidity Without Borders — The Alliance of Utopias.....	63
Fourteen Centuries of War against European Civilization .....	70
Reparations from Muslims? .....	81
The Spanish and the Portuguese — Once and Future Dhimmis? .....	85
Probing the Infidel World .....	90
The Execution of Britain .....	94
Will Holland Survive the 21st Century?.....	99
A Tribute to Italy.....	106
France: Can a Wounded Nation Heal Itself? .....	111
Eastern Europe and the New Threats to Freedom.....	117
On Germany and Muslims.....	121
Freedom Fighting “Fascists” .....	126
The Case of Sweden.....	131
Islamization and Cowardice in Scandinavia.....	149
On Anti-White Racism .....	163
Creating a European Indigenous People’s Movement.....	168
Can The West Be Saved? .....	172
Suggestions for the Future .....	181

*Defeating Eurabia* was first published online at the Gates of Vienna blog. My original intention was to say that anybody who wants to can republish it, on the Internet or in print, but in order to prevent abuses of my name, I will stipulate a few preconditions for those who want to republish it:

I should be credited as the author. This is almost too obvious to mention.

My material should be published unchanged. The book is over 131,000 words and contains a disproportionate amount of Scandinavian material. Those who want to can remove the chapter called *Islamization and Cowardice in Scandinavia*. This would make the book slightly shorter. The preferred solution is to use the entire book as it was published at Gates of Vienna, but I will accept republishing it minus this one chapter.

My material should not under any circumstances be mixed with other people's writings. The second this happens, I lose control over how my ideas are presented.

I will not allow people who support violent totalitarian ideologies, Communists, neo-Nazis or others, to use my material. Those who republish my book should share the spirit I have written the material in. Even though I am very critical of Islam, I will not allow or support attacks on random Muslims. Those who desire this are not allowed to use my material.

Those who republish my book should support the defense of Western civilization - and the defense of Israel as well. In my experience, those who disapprove of Israel's right to exist are either anti-Semites or suffer from very poor judgment. Sensible people should support Israel's self-defense against Jihad. If you don't do this then I don't trust your judgment on other issues, either. Moreover, Eurabia began with Western European countries abandoning their pro-Israeli position in favor of a pro-Arab one. It would make sense to reverse Eurabia by reversing this position.

Those who violate one or several of the above mentioned preconditions are not allowed to use my material and DO NOT republish it with my approval or permission.

I want to make sure that those who use my book are civilized human beings who share a very minimum of the spirit in which it was written. Apart from that, as long as you fulfil the preconditions mentioned above, I do not care about your religious or political views. I consider the situation and the impending threat of Islamization to be so serious that I want to spread warnings against this as far and wide as possible, as soon as possible. This means that I do not necessarily agree with those who republish my material, and they don't have to agree with all of my views; they just happen to find some sections of my book relevant.

*Defeating Eurabia* can be translated to other languages, as long as the translation is precise enough to accurately convey the original meaning of my text. The same stipulations as above, with the exclusion of violent, totalitarian movements etc., will also apply for translations. I should naturally be credited as the author, and the book should be republished unchanged.

As long as these minimum requirements are met, you can republish the book online and offline. You can republish it in print and if necessary charge some money for it to cover whatever expenses you had in publishing it. I have not included footnotes in the text, but since the material has been published online originally, those wanting to check my sources should read the online version of it and follow hyperlinks to the various books or articles used. They will usually be included in the online text, or can for the most part be found on the Internet.

Please note that the permission to republish in print goes only and exclusively for the material included in the book *Defeating Eurabia*, not the rest of my online material.

PS: I will challenge readers to find typos or grammatical errors in my book. English is not my first language, and any text of this length is bound to contain a few mistakes.

## The Eurabia Code

*This essay was originally published in several parts at the website Jihad Watch in October 2006, and then republished as one essay at the Gates of Vienna blog.*

*“That such an unnecessary and irrational superstate was ever embarked on will seem in future years to be perhaps the greatest folly of the modern era.” — Margaret Thatcher, former British Prime Minister*

*“A nation can survive its fools, and even the ambitious. But it cannot survive treason from within. An enemy at the gates is less formidable, for he is known and carries his banner openly. But the traitor moves amongst those within the gate freely, his sly whispers rustling through all the alleys, heard in the very halls of government itself. For the traitor appears not a traitor; he speaks in accents familiar to his victims, and he wears their face and their arguments, he appeals to the baseness that lies deep in the hearts of all men. He rots the soul of a nation, he works secretly and unknown in the night to undermine the pillars of the city, he infects the body politic so that it can no longer resist. A murderer is less to fear. The traitor is the plague.” — Cicero, Roman statesman and lawyer*

I decided to write this essay after a comment from a journalist, not a Leftist by my country’s standards, who dismissed Eurabia as merely a conspiracy theory, one on a par with The Protocols of the Elders of Zion. I do not disagree with the fact that conspiracy theories exist, nor that they can be dangerous. After all, the Protocols and the Dolchstosslegende, or “stab in the back myth” — the idea that Germany didn’t lose WW1 but was betrayed by Socialists, intellectuals and Jews — helped pave the way for Adolf Hitler and the Nazis before WW2.

However, what puzzles me is that it is a widely-held belief of many (not just in the Islamic world but in Europe and even in the United States) that the terror attacks that brought down the Twin Towers in New York City on September 11th 2001 were really a controlled demolition staged by the American government and then blamed on Muslims. I have seen this thesis talked about many times in Western media. While it is frequently (though not always) dismissed and mocked, it is least mentioned.

In contrast, Eurabia — which asserts that the Islamicization of Europe didn’t happen merely by accident but with the active participation of European political leaders — is hardly ever referred to at all, despite the fact that it is easier to document. Does the notion of Eurabia hit too close to home? Perhaps it doesn’t fit with the anti-American disposition of many journalists? Curiously enough, even those left-leaning journalists who are otherwise critical of the European Union because of its free market elements never write about Eurabia.

Because of this, I am going to test whether the Eurabia thesis is correct, or at least plausible. I have called this project The Eurabia Code, alluding to author Dan Brown’s massive bestseller *The Da Vinci Code*. Brown’s fictional account “documents” a conspiracy by the Church to cover up the truth about Jesus. I’m not sure my work will become equally popular, but I’m pretty sure it’s closer to reality. The next time Mr. Brown wants to write about massive conspiracies in Europe, he would be well-advised to set his eyes at Brussels rather than Rome. It would be a whole lot more interesting.

What follows is a brief outline of the thesis put forward by writer Bat Ye’or in her book [Eurabia: The Euro-Arab Axis](#). My information is based on her book (which should be read in full). In addition I have drawn from some of her articles and interviews. I republish the information with her blessing, but this summary is completely my own.

In an interview with Israeli newspaper Haaretz, Bat Ye’or explained how French President Charles de Gaulle, disappointed by the loss of the French colonies in Africa and the Middle East as well as with France’s waning influence in the international arena, decided in the 1960’s to create a strategic alliance with the Arab and Muslim world to compete with the dominance of the United States and the Soviet Union.

“This is a matter of a total transformation of Europe, which is the result of an intentional policy,” said Bat Ye’or. “We are now heading towards a total change in Europe, which will be more and more Islamicized and will become a political satellite of the Arab and Muslim world. The European leaders have decided on an alliance with the Arab world, through which they have committed to accept the Arab and Muslim approach

toward the United States and Israel. This is not only with respect to foreign policy, but also on issues engaging European society from within, such as immigration, the integration of the immigrants and the idea that Islam is part of Europe.”

“Europe is under a constant threat of terror. Terror is a way of applying pressure on the European countries to surrender constantly to the Arab representatives’ demands. They demand, for example, that Europe always speak out for the Palestinians and against Israel.”

Thus, the Eurabian project became an enlarged vision of the anti-American Gaullist policy dependent upon the formation of a Euro-Arab entity hostile to American influence. It facilitated European ambitions to maintain important spheres of influence in the former European colonies, while opening huge markets for European products in the Arab world, especially in oil-producing countries, in order to secure supplies of petroleum and natural gas to Europe. In addition, it would make the Mediterranean a Euro-Arab inland sea by favoring Muslim immigration and promoting Multiculturalism with a strong Islamic presence in Europe.

The use of the term “Eurabia” was first introduced in the mid-1970s, as the title of a journal edited by the President of the Association for Franco-Arab Solidarity, Lucien Bitterlein, and published collaboratively by the Groupe d’Etudes sur le Moyen-Orient (Geneva), France-Pays Arabes (Paris), and the Middle East International (London). Their articles called for common Euro-Arab positions at every level. These concrete proposals were not the musings of isolated theorists; instead they put forth concrete policy decisions conceived in conjunction with, and actualized by, European state leaders and European Parliamentarians.

During a November 27, 1967 press conference, Charles de Gaulle stated openly that French cooperation with the Arab world had become “the fundamental basis of our foreign policy.” By January 1969, the Second International Conference in Support of the Arab Peoples, held in Cairo, in its resolution 15, decided “...to form special parliamentary groups, where they did not exist, and to use the parliamentary platform support of the Arab people and the Palestinian resistance.” Five years later in Paris, July 1974, the Parliamentary Association for Euro-Arab Cooperation was created, under the Euro-Arab Dialogue rubric.

Bat Ye’or has highlighted this shared Euro-Arab political agenda. The first step was the construction of a common foreign policy. France was the driving force in this unification, which had already been envisaged by General de Gaulle’s inner circle and Arab politicians.

The Arab states demanded from Europe access to Western science and technology, European political independence from the United States, European pressure on the United States to align with their Arab policy and demonization of Israel as a threat to world peace, as well as measures favorable to Arab immigration and dissemination of Islamic culture in Europe. This cooperation would also included recognition of the Palestinians as a distinct people and the PLO and its leader Arafat as their representative. Up to 1973 they had been known only as Arab refugees, even by other Arabs. The concept of a Palestinian “nation” simply did not exist.

During the 1973 oil crisis, the Arab members of the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries announced that, due to the ongoing Yom Kippur War between Israel and its Arab neighbors Egypt and Syria, OPEC would no longer ship petroleum to Western nations that supported Israel. The sudden increase in oil prices was had lasting effects. Not only did it create a strong influx of petrodollars to countries such as Saudi Arabia, which permitted the Saudis to fund a worldwide Islamic resurgence, but it also had an impact in the West, especially in Europe.

However, Arab leaders had to sell their oil. Their people are very dependent on European economic and technological aid. The Americans made this point during the oil embargo in 1973. According to Ye’or, although the oil factor certainly helped cement the Euro-Arab Dialogue, it was primarily a pretext to cover up a policy that emerged in France before that crisis occurred. The policy, conceived in the 1960s, had strong antecedents in the French 19th-century dream of governing an Arab empire.

This political agenda has been reinforced by the deliberate cultural transformation of Europe. Euro-Arab Dialogue Symposia conducted in Venice (1977) and Hamburg (1983) included recommendations that have been successfully implemented. These recommendations were accompanied by a deliberate, privileged influx of Arab and other Muslim immigrants into Europe in enormous numbers.



The recommendations included:

1. Coordination of the efforts made by the Arab countries to spread the Arabic language and culture in Europe,
2. Creation of joint Euro-Arab Cultural Centers in European capitals,
3. The necessity of supplying European institutions and universities with Arab teachers specialized in teaching Arabic to Europeans, and
4. The necessity of cooperation between European and Arab specialists in order to present a positive picture of Arab-Islamic civilization and contemporary Arab issues to the educated public in Europe.

These agreements could not be set forth in written documents and treaties due to their politically sensitive and fundamentally undemocratic nature. The European leaders thus carefully chose to call their ideas “dialogue.” All meetings, committees and working groups included representatives from European Community nations and the European Council along with members from Arab countries and the Arab League. Proceedings and decisions took place in closed sessions. No official minutes were recorded.

The Euro-Arab Dialogue (EAD) is a political, economic and cultural institution designed to ensure perfect cohesion between Europeans and Arabs. Its structure was set up at conferences in Copenhagen (15 December 1973), and Paris (31 July 1974). The principal agent of this policy is the European Parliamentary Association for Euro-Arab Cooperation, founded in 1974. The other principal organs of The Dialogue are the MEDEA Institute and the European Institute of Research on Mediterranean and Euro-Arab Cooperation, created in 1995 with the backing of the European Commission.

In an interview with Jamie Glazov of Frontpage Magazine, Ye’or explained how “in domestic policy, the EAD established a close cooperation between the Arab and European media television, radio, journalists, publishing houses, academia, cultural centers, school textbooks, student and youth associations, tourism. Church interfaith dialogues were determinant in the development of this policy. Eurabia is therefore this strong Euro-Arab network of associations — a comprehensive symbiosis with cooperation and partnership on policy, economy, demography and culture.”

Eurabia’s driving force, the Parliamentary Association for Euro-Arab Cooperation, was created in Paris in 1974. It now has over six hundred members — from all major European political parties — active in their own national parliaments, as well as in the European parliament. France continues to be the key protagonist of this association.

A wide-ranging policy was sketched out. It entailed a symbiosis of Europe with the Muslim Arab countries that would endow Europe — and especially France, the project’s prime mover — with a weight and a prestige to rival that of the United States. This policy was undertaken quite discreetly, and well outside of official treaties, using the innocent-sounding name of the Euro-Arab Dialogue. The organization functioned under the auspices of European government ministers, working in close association with their Arab counterparts, and with the representatives of the European Commission and the Arab League. The goal was the creation of a pan-Mediterranean entity, permitting the free circulation both of men and of goods

On the cultural front there began a complete re-writing of history, which was first undertaken during the 1970s in European universities. This process was ratified by the parliamentary assembly of the Council of Europe in September 1991, at its meeting devoted to “The Contribution of the Islamic Civilisation to European culture.” It was reaffirmed by French President Jacques Chirac in his address of April 8, 1996 in Cairo, and reinforced by Romano Prodi, president of the powerful European Commission, the EU’s “government,” and later Italian Prime Minister, through the creation of a Foundation on the Dialogue of Cultures and Civilizations. This foundation was to control everything said, written and taught about Islam in Europe.

Over the past three decades, the EEC and the EU’s political and cultural organizations have invented a fantasy Islamic civilization and history. The historical record of violations of basic human rights for all non- Muslims and women under sharia (Islamic Law) is either ignored or dismissed. In this worldview the only dangers

come from the United States and Israel. The creators of Eurabia have conducted a successful propaganda campaign against these two countries in the European media. This fabrication was made easier by pre-existing currents of anti-Semitism and anti-Americanism in parts of Europe, although both sentiments have been greatly inflated by Eurabians and their collaborators.

On January 31, 2001, with the recrudescence of Palestinian terrorist jihad, European Foreign Affairs Commissioner Chris Patten declared to the European Parliament that Europe's foreign policy should give special attention to its southern flank (the Arab countries, in EU jargon), adding that he was delighted by the general agreement to give greater visibility to the Mediterranean Partnership.

Bat Ye'or thinks that "Our politicians are perfectly informed of Islamic history and current policies by their embassies, agents and specialists. There is no innocence there, but tremendous inflexibility in corruption, cynicism and the perversion of values."

In the preface to her book, she states that "This book describes Europe's evolution from a Judeo-Christian civilization, with important post-Enlightenment secular elements, into a post—Judeo-Christian civilization that is subservient to the ideology of jihad and the Islamic powers."

The new European civilization in the making can correctly be termed a "civilization of dhimmitude." The word dhimmitude comes from the Koranic word "dhimmi." It refers to the subjugated, non-Muslim individuals who accept restrictive and humiliating subordination to Islamic power in order to avoid enslavement or death. The entire Muslim world as we know it today is a product of this 1,300 year-old jihad dynamic, whereby once thriving non-Muslim majority civilizations have been reduced to a state of dysfunction and dhimmitude. The dhimmis are inferior beings who endure humiliation and aggression in silence. This arrangement allows Muslims to enjoy an impunity that increases both their hatred and their feeling of superiority, under the protection of the law.

Eurabia is a novel new entity. It possesses political, economic, religious, cultural, and media components, which are imposed on Europe by powerful governmental lobbies. While Europeans live within Eurabia's constraints, outside of a somewhat confused awareness, few are really conscious of them on a daily basis.

This Eurabian policy, expressed in obscure wording, is conducted at the highest political levels and coordinated over the whole of the European Union. It spreads an anti-American and anti-Semitic Euro-Arab sub-culture into the fiber of every social, media and cultural sector. Dissidents are silenced or boycotted. Sometimes they are fired from their jobs, victims of a totalitarian "correctness" imposed mainly by the academic, media and political sectors.

According to Ye'or, France and the rest of Western Europe can no longer change their policy: "It is a project that was conceived, planned and pursued consistently through immigration policy, propaganda, church support, economic associations and aid, cultural, media and academic collaboration. Generations grew up within this political framework; they were educated and conditioned to support it and go along with it."

Are Bat Ye'or's claims correct, or even possible?

Bernard Lewis has pointed out that, by common consent among historians, "the modern history of the Middle East begins in the year 1798, when the French Revolution arrived in Egypt in the form of a small expeditionary force led by a young general called Napoleon Bonaparte—who conquered and then ruled it for a while with appalling ease."

In an unsuccessful effort to gain the support of the Egyptian populace, Napoleon issued proclamations praising Islam. "People of Egypt," he proclaimed upon his entry to Alexandria in 1798, "You will be told that I have come to destroy your religion; do not believe it! Reply that I have come to restore your rights, to punish the usurpers, and that more than the Mamluks, I respect God, his Prophet, and the Qur'an."

According to an eyewitness, Napoleon ended his proclamation with the phrase, "God is great and Muhammad is his prophet." To Muslim ears, this sounded like the shahada — the declaration of belief in the oneness of Allah and in Prophet Muhammad as his last messenger. Recitation of the shahadah, the first of the five pillars of Islam, is considered to mark one's conversion to Islam. Muslims could thus conclude that Napoleon



had converted to Islam. In fact, one of his generals, Jacques Ménéou, did convert to Islam.

The French were later defeated and forced to leave Egypt by the English admiral Lord Nelson. Although the French expedition to Egypt lasted only three years, it demonstrated that the West was now so superior to the Islamic world that Westerners could enter the Arab heartland, then still a part of the Ottoman Empire, at will. Only another Western power could force them to leave. The shock of this realization triggered the first attempts to reform Islam in the 19th century.

A positive result of Western conquest was the influx of French scientists into Egypt and the foundation of modern Egyptology. Most importantly, it led to the discovery of the Rosetta Stone, which was later used by French philologist Jean-François Champollion to decipher the ancient Egyptian hieroglyphs. However, the encounter also left a lasting impact in Europe, and above all in France.

The French invasion of Algeria in 1830 marked another chapter in this tale. Later, the French ruled Tunisia and Morocco. Finally, after the First World War, the French gained mandates over the former Turkish territories of the Ottoman Empire that make up what is now Syria and Lebanon. After the Second World War, French troops gradually left Arab lands, culminating with war and Algerian independence in 1962. However, their long relationship with Arabs resulted in France's belief that she had a special relationship with and an understanding of Arabs and Muslims. Along with French leadership in continental Europe, this would now provide the basis of a new foreign policy.

President de Gaulle pushed for a France and a Europe independent of the two superpowers. In a speech, he stated that "Yes, it is Europe, from the Atlantic to the Urals, it is Europe, it is the whole of Europe, that will decide the destiny of the world." In 1966, he withdrew France from the common NATO military command, but remained within the organization.

Following the Six Days War in 1967, de Gaulle's condemnation of the Israelis for their occupation of the West Bank and the Gaza Strip marked a significant change in French foreign policy. Previously, France — as well as the rest of Western Europe — had been strongly pro-Israel, even going to war together with Israel as late as 1956 against Nasser's Egypt. From 1967 on, however, France embarked on a decidedly pro-Arab course.

It has been said that English foreign policy has remained the same since the 16th century. Its goal was to prevent any country, whether Spain, France, or later Germany, from dominating continental Europe to the extent that it represents a threat to England. On the other hand, one could argue that French foreign policy has also remained the same for several centuries; its goal is to champion French leadership over Europe and the Mediterranean region in order to contain Anglo-Saxon (and later Anglo-American) dominance. This picture was complicated by the unification of Germany in the late 19th century, but its outlines remain to this day.

Napoleon is the great hero of French PM de Villepin. Several prominent French leaders stated quite openly in 2005 that the proposed EU Constitution was basically an enlarged France. Justice Minister Dominique Perben said: "We have finally obtained this 'Europe à la française' that we have awaited for so long. This constitutional treaty is an enlarged France. It is a Europe written in French."

From its inception, European integration has been a French-led enterprise. The fact that the French political elite have never renounced the maintenance of their leadership over Europe was amply demonstrated during the Iraq war. President Chirac famously said in 2003 after Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic backed the US position "They missed a good opportunity to shut up," adding "These countries have been not very well behaved and rather reckless of the danger of aligning themselves too rapidly with the American position."

Jean Monnet, French economist never elected to public office, is regarded by many as the architect of European integration. Monnet was a well-connected pragmatist who worked behind the scenes towards the gradual creation of European unity.

Richard North, publisher of the blog EU Referendum and co-author (with Christopher Booker) of The Great Deception: Can The European Union Survive, relates that for years — at least from the 1920s — Jean Monnet had dreamed of building a "United States of Europe." Although what Monnet really had in mind was the creation of a European entity with all the attributes of a state, an "anodyne phrasing was deliberately chosen

with a view to making it difficult to dilute by converting it into just another intergovernmental body. It was also couched in this fashion so that it would not scare off national governments by emphasising that its purpose was to override their sovereignty.”

In their analysis of the EU’s history, the authors claim that the EU was not born out of WW2, as many people seem to think. It had been planned at least a generation before that.

The Schuman Declaration of 9 May 1950, widely presented as the beginning of the efforts towards a European Union and commemorated in “Europe Day,” contains phrases which state that it is “a first step in the federation of Europe”, and that “this proposal will lead to the realization of the first concrete foundation of a European federation.” However, as critics of the EU have noted, these political objectives are usually omitted when the Declaration is referred to, and most people are unaware of their existence.

A federation is, of course, a State and “yet for decades now the champions of EC/EU integration have been swearing blind that they have no knowledge of any such plans. The EEC/EC/EU has steadily acquired ever more features of a supranational Federation: flag, anthem, Parliament, Supreme Court, currency, laws.”

The EU founders “were careful only to show their citizens the benign features of their project. It had been designed to be implemented incrementally, as an ongoing process, so that no single phase of the project would arouse sufficient opposition as to stop or derail it.”

Booker and North call the European Union “a slow-motion coup d’état: the most spectacular coup d’état in history,” designed to gradually and carefully sideline the democratic process and subdue the older nation states of Europe without saying so publicly.

The irony is that France is now held hostage by the very forces she herself set in motion. The Jihad riots by Muslim immigrants in France in 2005 demonstrated that Eurabia is no longer a matter of French foreign policy, it is now French domestic policy. France will burn unless she continues to appease Arabs and agree to their agenda.

The growth of the Islamic population is explosive. According to some, one out of three babies born in France is a Muslim. Hundreds of Muslim ghettos already de facto follow sharia, not French law. Some believe France will quietly become a Muslim country, while others predict a civil war in the near future.

Maybe there is some poetic justice in the fact that the country that initiated and has led the formation of Eurabia will now be destroyed by its own Frankenstein monster. However, gloating over France’s dilemma won’t help. The impending downfall of France is bad news for the rest of the West. What will happen to French financial resources? Above all, who will inherit hundreds of nuclear warheads? Will these weapons fall into the hands of Jihadist Muslims, too?

MEDEA (the European Institute for Research on Mediterranean and Euro-Arab Cooperation), supported by the European Commission, is one of the key components of the Euro-Arab dialogue. On its own webpage, it states that:

“The Euro-Arab Dialogue as a forum shared by the European Community and the League of Arab States arose out of a French initiative and was launched at the European Council in Copenhagen in December 1973, shortly after the “October War” and the oil embargo. As the Europeans saw it, it was to be a forum to discuss economic affairs, whereas the Arab side saw it rather as one to discuss political affairs.

MEDEA Institute wishes to be a resource and a reference point for people wanting to engage in the Euro-Mediterranean dialogue. Via its meetings and talks the Institute seeks to create exchanges between political, economic, and diplomatic players, experts, journalists, academics and others.”

As Bat Ye’or points out, while most of the workings of Eurabia are hidden from the public view, sometimes we can catch glimpses of it if we know what to look for. If you search the archives of the MEDEA website and other sources and read the documents carefully, the information is there. Even more material exists on paper, both in French and in English. I argue, as does Bat Ye’or, that there are sufficient amounts of information

available to validate the thesis of Eurabia.

One of the documents Bat Ye'or was kind enough to send me (which she mentions in the French version of her book about Eurabia but not in the English version) is the Common Strategy of the European Council — Vision of the EU for the Mediterranean Region, from June 19th 2000.

It includes many recommendations, such as:

“to elaborate partnership-building measures, notably by promoting regular consultations and exchanges of information with its Mediterranean partners, support the interconnection of infrastructure between Mediterranean partners, and between them and the EU, take all necessary measures to facilitate and encourage the involvement of civil society as well as the further development of human exchanges between the EU and the Mediterranean partners. NGOs will be encouraged to participate in cooperation at bilateral and regional levels. *Particular attention will be paid to the media and universities* [my emphasis].”

It also includes the goal of assisting the Arab partners with “the process of achieving free trade with the EU.” This may be less innocent than it sounds, as I will come back to later.

The Strategy also wants to “pursue, in order to fight intolerance, racism and xenophobia, the dialogue between cultures and civilisations.” Notice that this statement preceded both the start of the second Palestinian intifada as well as the terror attacks of September 11th 2001. It was thus part of an ongoing process, rather than a response to any particular international incident.

One point in the document is particularly interesting. The EU wanted to “promote the identification of correspondences between legal systems of different inspirations in order to resolve civil law problems relating to individuals: laws of succession and family law, including divorce.”

In plain English, it is difficult to see this bureaucratic obfuscation as anything other than an indicator that the EU countries will be lenient, adjusting their secular legislation to the sharia requirements of Muslim immigrants in family matters.

In another document from December 2003, which is available online, Javier Solana, the Secretary General of the Council of the European Union, Romano Prodi, President of the European Commission and Chris Patten, member of the European Commission, have signed a plan for “Strengthening the EU’s Partnership with the Arab World.”

This includes the creation of a free trade area, but also plans to “invigorate cultural/religious/civilisation and media dialogue using existing or planned instruments, including the planned Euro-Mediterranean Foundation for the Dialogue of Cultures and Civilisations.

Arab immigrants make a substantial contribution to the development of Europe. The EU is firmly committed to fight all manifestations of racism and discrimination in all its forms. [*What constitutes discrimination? Secular laws?*] Full respect for the rights of immigrants in Europe is a consistent policy throughout Europe. Its implementation should be improved further and co-operation in the framework of existing agreements should be enhanced to take into account the concerns of Arab partners.”

Super-Eurocrat Romano Prodi wants more cooperation with Arab countries. He talks about a free trade zone with the Arab world, but this implies that Arab countries would enjoy access to the four freedoms of the EU’s inner market, **which includes the free movement of people across national borders**. This fact, the potentially massive implications of establishing an “inner market” with an Arab world with a booming population growth, is virtually NEVER debated or even mentioned in European media. Yet it could mean the end of Europe as we once knew it.

Another statement from the “Sixth Euro-Med Ministerial Conference: reinforcing and bringing the Partnership forward” in Brussels, 28 November 2003, makes the intention of this internal Euro-Mediterranean market:

“This initiative offers the EU’s neighbouring partners, in exchange for tangible political and economic reforms,

gradual integration into the expanded European internal market and the possibility of ultimately reaching the EU's four fundamental freedoms: free movement of goods, services, capital **and people** *[my emphasis]*. Ministers are also expected to back the Commission's proposal<sup>1</sup> to set up a Euro-Mediterranean Foundation for the Dialogue of Cultures, a Euro-Mediterranean Parliamentary Assembly."

In June 2006, then newly elected Italian Prime Minister Romano Prodi stated that:

"It's time to look south and relaunch a new policy of cooperation for the Mediterranean." Prodi was outlining a joint Italian-Spanish initiative which sought to provide countries facing the Mediterranean with "different" political solutions from those offered in the Euro-Mediterranean partnership. The prime minister then explained that the Barcelona Process — whose best known aspect is the creation of a free trade zone by 2010 — was no longer sufficient and a new different approach was needed. "The countries on the southern shores of the Mediterranean expect that from us" he added.

Notice how Prodi, whom Bat Ye'or has identified as a particularly passionate Eurabian, referred to what the Arabs expected from European leaders. He failed to say whether or not there was great excitement among Europeans over the prospect of an even freer flow of migrants from Arab countries and Turkey, which is what will result from this "Euro-Mediterranean free trade zone."

During the Euro-Mediterranean mid-term Meeting of Ministers of Foreign Affairs in Dublin in May 2004, the participants declared that:

"Work is now in progress to develop an agreed view on relations with the area which extends from Mauritania to Iran — the Mediterranean and the Middle East. The [European] Union has proposed to include Mediterranean partners in the European Neighbourhood Policy."

The EU can offer a more intensive political dialogue and greater access to EU programmes and policies, including their gradual participation in the four freedoms particularly the Single Market, as well as reinforced co-operation on justice and home affairs."

Again, exactly what does "co-operation on justice and home affairs" with Egypt, Syria and Algeria mean? I don't know, but I'm not sure whether I will like the answer.

The Barcelona declaration from 1995 encouraged "contacts between parliamentarians" and invited the European Parliament, with other Parliaments, to launch "the Euro-Mediterranean parliamentary dialogue." In March 2004, this was converted into a specific institution called The Euro-Mediterranean Parliamentary Assembly, EMPA ([pdf](#)). During the Euro-Mediterranean Ministerial Conference in Crete in May 2003, the Ministers included a provision which envisaged the consultative role the Parliamentary Assembly will play within the framework of the Barcelona process.

EU Commissioner Chris Patten has reiterated the European Commission's readiness to co-operate fully with the Assembly, giving the Assembly the right to comment on any subject of interest to the Euro-Arab Dialogue.

The Assembly consists of 120 members from EU countries, both members of national parliaments and of the European Parliament, and an equal number of representatives from the Parliaments of the Mediterranean partner countries.

Like most Europeans, I hadn't even heard about this institution before coming across it during an Internet search. However, it is apparently going to influence the future of my entire continent. This set-up leaves me with some questions. When we know that these "Mediterranean partner countries" include non-democratic Arab countries such as Syria, isn't it disturbing that representatives from these countries should participate in a permanent institution with consultative powers over the internal affairs of the European Union? Especially when we know that our own, democratically elected national parliaments have already been reduced to the status of "consultation" with unelected federal EU lawmakers in Brussels?

The Algiers Declaration for a Shared Vision of the Future was made after a Congress held in Algeria in February 2006. The document states that: "It is essential to create a Euro-Mediterranean entity founded on Universal Values" and that "It is crucial to positively emphasise all common cultural heritage, even if

marginalised or forgotten.” A Common Action Plan draws up a large number of recommendations on how to achieve this new Euro-Mediterranean entity. Among these recommendations are:

- Adapt existing organisations and the contents of media to the objectives of the North- South dialogue, and set up a Euro-Mediterranean journalism centre
- Set up a network jointly managed by the Mediterranean partners in order to develop “a harmonised education system” [A “harmonized education system” between the Arab world and Europe? What does that include? Do I want to know? Will they tell us before it is a fait accompli?]
- Facilitate the transfer of know-how between the EU countries and the Mediterranean partner nations and “encourage the circulation of individuals”
- Prepare action and arguments in support of facilitating the mobility of individuals, especially of students, intellectuals, artists, businessmen “and all conveyors of dialogue”
- Set up Ministries responsible for Mediterranean affairs in countries of the North and of the South [Europe and the Arab world, in Eurocrat newspeak], in order to benefit from a better management of Mediterranean policy;
- Train teachers and exchange students between the North and the South and set up a network of Euro-Mediterranean Youth clubs
- Establish a “civil watchdog” anti-defamation observatory (with an Internet tool and a legal help network), to cope with racist remarks and the propagation of hate towards people of different religion, nationality or ethnical background

These agreements, completely rewriting European history books to make them more Islam-friendly, and gradually silencing “Islamophobia” as racism, are being implemented even now.

Walter Schwimmer, the Austrian diplomat and Secretary General of the Council of Europe from 1999 to 2004, told foreign ministers at the Islamic conference in Istanbul (June 15th 2004) that the Islamic component is an integral part of Europe’s diversity. He reaffirmed the commitment of the Council of Europe to work against Islamophobia, anti-Semitism and other forms of intolerance.

The Council was also actively involved in the co-organisation of a Conference on the Image of Arab-Islamic culture in European history textbooks, which took place in Cairo in December 2004. The event was held within the framework of the Euro-Arab Dialogue “Learning to Live together.” The aim of the conference was to examine negative stereotyping in the image of Arab-Islamic culture presented in existing history textbooks, and to discuss ways to overcome this stereotyping.

In the European Parliament, the German Christian Democrat Hans-Gert Pöttering stated that school textbooks should be reviewed for intolerant depictions of Islam by experts overseen by the European Union and Islamic leaders. He said textbooks should be checked to ensure they promoted European values without propagating religious stereotypes or prejudice. He also suggested that the EU could co-operate with the 56-nation Organisation of the Islamic Conference to create a textbook review committee.

In June 2005 in Rabat, Morocco, a conference was held on “Fostering Dialogue among Cultures and Civilizations.” The Conference was jointly organized by UNESCO, the Islamic Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (ISESCO), the Organization of the Islamic Conference (OIC), the Arab League Educational, Cultural and Scientific Organization (ALECSO), the Danish Centre for Culture and Development (DCCD) and the Anna Lindh Euro-Mediterranean Foundation for the Dialogue between Cultures (Alexandria, Egypt).

Notice that this was months before the Danish Muhammad cartoons created havoc. It was not a reaction to this issue; rather it was a part of a sustained, ongoing process to promote Arabic-Islamic culture in Europe.



Among the recommendations that were raised by Mr. Olaf Gerlach Hansen, Director General of the DCCD: “We are interested in new actions in the media, in culture and in education. These proposals include:

- Concrete initiatives to develop “intercultural competencies” in the training of new generations of journalists — Concrete initiatives for links and exchanges between journalists, editors, media-institutions, which encourage intercultural co-operation” — Concrete initiatives for curriculum development through new educational materials and revision of existing textbooks.

Although not stated directly, one may reasonably assume that among the “negative stereotypes” to be removed from the textbooks used to teach history to European schoolchildren are any and all references to the 1300 years of continuous Jihad warfare against Europe. These recommendations were accepted and incorporated into The Rabat Commitment.

According to Serge Trifkovic, “The present technological, cultural and financial strength of Europe is a façade that conceals a deep underlying moral and demographic weakness. The symptoms of the malaise are apparent in the unprecedented demographic collapse and in the loss of a sense of place and history that go hand-in-hand with the expansion of the European Union. The emerging transnational hyper-state is actively indoctrinating its subject-population into believing and accepting that the demographic shift in favor of Muslim aliens is actually a blessing.”

He points out specifically the EU Parliamentary Assembly Recommendation N° 1162 (19 September 1991) on “the contribution of the Islamic civilization to European culture.” A decade later, in its General policy recommendation n° 5: “Combating intolerance and discrimination against Muslims,” the European Commission against Racism and Intolerance emphasized “Islam’s positive contribution to the continuing development of European societies, of which it is an integral part.” It expressed strong regret “that Islam is sometimes portrayed inaccurately [as] a threat.”

The ECRI called on the EU member states to adopt measures that would effectively outlaw any serious debate about Islam and introduce pro-Muslim “affirmative action.” European countries should:

- modify curricula to prevent “distorted interpretations of religious and cultural history” and “portrayal of Islam on perceptions of hostility and menace”;
- encourage debate in the media on the image which they convey of Islam and on their responsibility to avoid perpetuating prejudice and bias.

Trifkovic says “Cynically defeatist, self-absorbed and unaccountable to anyone but their own corrupt class, the Eurocrats are just as bad as jihad’s fellow-travelers; they are its active abettors and facilitators.”

Eurabians want to create a unity of the Mediterranean region. This desire is strikingly similar to the goals of some Islamic organizations.

The Muslim Brotherhood, regarded as the most important Islamic movement of the past century, was founded by Hassan al-Banna in 1928, inspired by contemporary European Fascists in addition to Islamic texts.

German historian Egon Flaig quotes Banna as saying: “We want the flag of Islam to fly over those lands again who were lucky enough to be ruled by Islam for a time, and hear the call of the muezzin praise God. Then the light of Islam died out and they returned to disbelief. Andalusia, Sicily, the Balkans, Southern Italy and the Greek islands are all Islamic colonies which have to return to Islam’s embrace. The Mediterranean and the Red Sea have to become internal seas of Islam, as they used to be.”

Patrick Poole describes how discussion of a document called “The Project” so far has been limited to the top-secret world of Western intelligence communities. Only through the work of an intrepid Swiss journalist, Sylvain Besson, has information regarding The Project finally been made public. It was found in a raid of a luxurious villa in Campione, Switzerland on November 7, 2001. The target of the raid was Youssef Nada, who



has had active association with the Muslim Brotherhood for more than 50 years.

Included in the documents seized was a 14-page plan written in Arabic and dated December 1, 1982, which outlined a 12-point strategy to “establish an Islamic government on earth” — identified as *The Project*. According to testimony given to Swiss authorities by Nada, the unsigned document was prepared by “Islamic researchers” associated with the Muslim Brotherhood. It represents a flexible, multi-phased, long-term approach to the “cultural invasion” of the West.

The Project has served for more than two decades as the Muslim Brotherhood “master plan.” Some of its recommendations include:

- Using deception to mask the intended goals of Islamist actions
- Building extensive social networks of schools, hospitals and charitable organizations
- Involving ideologically committed Muslims in institutions on all levels in the West, including government, NGOs, private organizations
- Instrumentally using existing Western institutions until they can be put into service of Islam
- Instituting alliances with Western “progressive” organizations that share similar goals

Included among this group of Muslim Brotherhood intellectuals is Yusuf al-Qaradawi, an Egyptian-born, Qatar-based Islamist cleric. Both Sylvain Besson and Scott Burgess provide extensive comparisons between Qaradawi’s publication, *Priorities of the Islamic Movement in the Coming Phase*, published in 1990, and *The Project*. They note the striking similarities in the language used and the plans and methods both documents advocate.

As Patrick Poole says, “What is startling is how effectively the Islamist plan for conquest outlined in *The Project* has been implemented by Muslims in the West for more than two decades.”

Yusuf al-Qaradawi, one of the most influential clerics in Sunni Islam, has predicted that “Islam will return to Europe as a conqueror and victor,” was an important figure during the Muhammad cartoons riots, whipping up anger against Denmark and the West.

According to Dr. Rachel Ehrenfeld and Alyssa A. Lappen, “Clearly, the riots in Denmark and throughout the world were not spontaneous, but planned and organized well in advance by Islamist organizations that support the MB, and with funding mostly from Saudi Arabia.”

The current leader of the international Muslim Brotherhood, Mohammad Mahdi Akef, recently issued a new strategy calling on all its member organizations to serve its global agenda of defeating the West. Akef has called the U.S. “a Satan.” “I expect America to collapse soon,” declaring, “I have complete faith that Islam will invade Europe and America.”

Ehrenfeld and Lappen state that the Muslim Brotherhood and its offspring organizations employ the Flexibility strategy:

“This strategy calls for a minority group of Muslims to use all ‘legal’ means to infiltrate majority-dominated, non-Muslim secular and religious institutions, starting with its universities. As a result, ‘Islamized’ Muslim and non-Muslim university graduates enter the nation’s workforce, including its government and civil service sectors, where they are poised to subvert law enforcement agencies, intelligence communities, military branches, foreign services, and financial institutions.”

In the Middle East Quarterly, Lorenzo Vidino writes about “The Muslim Brotherhood’s Conquest of Europe.”

According to him, “Since the early 1960s, Muslim Brotherhood members and sympathizers have moved to Europe and slowly but steadily established a wide and well-organized network of mosques, charities, and Islamic organizations.”

One of the Muslim Brotherhood's first pioneers in Germany was Sa'id Ramadan, the personal secretary of Brotherhood founder Hassan al-Banna. The oil-rich kingdom of Saudi Arabia has granted an influx of money to the powerful Islamic Center of Geneva, Switzerland, run by Sa'id's son Hani Ramadan, brother of Tariq Ramadan. Hani Ramadan was made infamous by — among other things — a 2002 article in the French daily *Le Monde* defending the stoning of adulterers to death. Tariq Ramadan, a career “moderate Muslim,” later called for a “moratorium” on stoning.

According to Vidino, “The ultimate irony is that Muslim Brotherhood founder Hassan al-Banna dreamed of spreading Islamism throughout Egypt and the Muslim world. He would have never dreamed that his vision might also become a reality in Europe.”

Former Muslim Dr Patrick Sookhdeo warns that the Islamicization going on in European cities is not happening by chance. It “is the result of a careful and deliberate strategy by certain Muslim leaders which was planned in 1980 when the Islamic Council of Europe published a book called *Muslim Communities in Non-Muslim States*.”

The instructions given in the book told Muslims to get together and organize themselves into viable Muslim communities. They should set up mosques, community centres and Islamic schools. At all costs they must avoid being assimilated by the majority, and to resist assimilation must group themselves geographically, forming areas of high Muslim concentration.

Douglas Farah writes about the largely successful efforts by Islamic groups in the West to buy large amounts of real estate, territory that effectively becomes “Muslim” land once it is in the hands of Islamist groups. Some groups are signing agreements to guarantee that they will only sell the land to other Muslims.

The Brotherhood, particularly, is active in investments in properties and businesses across Europe, laying the groundwork for the future network that will be able to react rapidly and with great flexibility in case of another attempted crackdown on the group's financial structure. Most of the money comes from Saudi Arabia and Kuwait.

According to Farah, the governments of Europe and the United States continue to allow these groups to flourish and seek for the “moderate” elements that can be embraced as a counter-balance to the “radical” elements: “We do not have a plan. They do. History shows that those that plan, anticipate and have a coherent strategy usually win. We are not winning.”

In March 2006, the two-day plenary session of the Euro-Mediterranean Parliamentary Assembly, held in Brussels approved a resolution which “condemned the offence” caused by the Danish cartoons of the prophet Muhammad as well “as the violence which their publication provoked.” These MEPs and national MPs from the EU and Arab countries also urged governments to “ensure respect for religious beliefs and to encourage the values of tolerance, freedom and multiculturalism.”

During the parliamentary assembly, Egyptian parliament speaker Ahmed Sorour insisted that the cartoons published in Denmark and other recent events showed the existence of a “cultural deficit.” Jordanian MP Hashem al-Qaisi also condemned the cartoons, claiming that it is not sufficient to deplore the cartoons as these things might occur again in another country.

And European Parliament president Josep Borrell referred to the Mediterranean as “a concentrate of all the problems facing humanity.” He said that after one year presiding over the assembly he “still did not fully understand the complexities of the Mediterranean.”

Following the cartoons affair, EU foreign policy chief Javier Solana had travelled to the Middle East and made joint statements with Islamic leaders that “freedom of the press entails responsibility and discretion and should respect the beliefs and tenets of all religions.” Solana said that he had discussed means to ensure that “religious symbols can be protected.” He held talks with Sheikh Mohammed Sayed Tantawi of Al Azhar University, the highest seat of learning in Sunni Islam, and Arab League Secretary-General Amr Moussa.

Solana also met with the leader of the Organisation of the Islamic Conference (OIC), Ekmeleddin Ihsanoglu. Following their discussion, Solana “expressed our sincere regret that religious feelings have been hurt”, and

vowed “to reach out... to make sure that people’s hearts and minds are not hurt again.”

Only a few years earlier, Mr. Solana, then Secretary General of NATO, in [a speech](#) stated that “the root cause of conflicts in Europe and beyond can be traced directly to the absence of democracy and openness. The absence of the pressure valve of democratic discourse can lead these societies to explode into violence.” The irony that he himself is now trying to curtail the democratic discourse in Europe through the promotion of Islamic censorship apparently did not occur to him.

Meanwhile, the tentacles of the vast, inflated EU bureaucracy insinuate themselves into regulations on every conceivable subject. Some of the examples of the bureaucracy are ridiculous; some are funny. But there is a sinister side to the European bureaucracy:

- The promotion of an official, “EU federal ideology” advocating Multiculturalism;
- The denunciation as “xenophobes” of all those who want to preserve their democracy at the nation state level; and
- Calling those who would limit Third World immigration “racists.”

A report from the EU’s racism watchdog said that more must be done to combat racism and “Islamophobia.” One method of accomplishing this is the promotion of [a lexicon](#) which shuns purportedly offensive and culturally insensitive terms. This lexicon would set down guidelines for EU officials and politicians prohibiting what they may say. “Certainly ‘Islamic terrorism’ is something we will not use... we talk about ‘terrorists who abusively invoke Islam’,” an EU official said.

Early in 2006, the EU’s human rights commissioner Alvaro Gil-Robles’s criticized a plan to revamp Christianity as a [school subject](#) in elementary schools in Denmark. Gil-Robles said doing so went against European values. “Religion as a school subject should be a general course that attempts to **give students insight into the three monotheistic religions** [*my emphasis*],” he said. The “three monotheistic religions” means Christianity, Judaism and Islam.

As I see it, there are several possible ways of dealing with the issue of education about religion.

1. Teach the traditional religions within a particular country, which in Europe means Christianity and Judaism.
2. Teach all the major world religions.
3. Leave religion out of the curriculum.

What the European Union does, however, is to **treat Islam as a traditional, European religion on par with Christianity and Judaism. This is a crucial component of Eurabian thinking** and practice. Notice how EU authorities in this case directly interfered to force a once-independent nation state to include more teachings of Islam in its school curriculum in order to instill their children with a proper dose of Eurabian indoctrination. Notice also that they didn’t ask for more teaching of Buddhism or Hinduism. Only Islam is being pushed.

In another case, the European Commission rebuffed a call by the Polish president for an EU-wide debate on reinstating the [death penalty](#). “The death penalty is not compatible with European values,” a Commission spokesman said. Again, the issue here is not your opinion regarding the death penalty. The real issue is that the metasticizing EU has already defined what constitutes “European values.” Thus, major issues are simply beyond public debate. The innocent-sounding phrase “European values” cloaks a federal, Eurabian ideology enforced across the entire European Union without regard to the popular will.

Perhaps the most shameful and embarrassing aspect of the history of Eurabia is how the supposedly critical and independent European media has allowed itself to be corrupted or deceived by the Eurabians. Most of the documents about the Euro-Arab Dialogue place particular emphasis on working with the media, and the Eurabians have played the European media like a Stradivarius. Aided by a pre-existing anti-Americanism and anti-Semitism, European media have been willing to demonize the United States and Israel while remaining

largely silent on the topic Eurabia.

In May 2006, a big conference was held in Vienna involving media figures (journalists) from all over Europe, who met with partners from the Arab world as a part of the Euro-Arab Dialogue.

European officials responded publicly with “regret” to Israel’s ambassador to Austria Dan Ashbel’s decision to boycott the conference on racism in the media because of concern in Jerusalem that anti-Semitism was getting short shrift at the meeting. Speaking for the conference — entitled “Racism, Xenophobia and the Media: Towards Respect and Understanding of all Religions and Cultures” — an official claimed that anti-Semitism was not taken off the agenda. This official countered that the meeting was “primarily a dialogue between the media representatives of all the Euro-Med partners on the problems that beset their profession. These include xenophobia, racism, anti-Semitism and **Islamophobia** [*my emphasis*].”

Writer Bruce Bawer thinks that many Europeans recognize that Multiculturalism is leading their societies to disaster. But they’ve heard all their lives from officially approved authorities that any concern about Multiculturalism and its consequences is tantamount to racism:

“There’s a widespread resignation to the fact that multiculturalists control the media, academy, state agencies, and so on. They know very well that if you want to get ahead in European society, you don’t take on multicultural orthodoxy. The political establishment seems solidly planted, unmovable, unchangeable. There may be a widespread rage, in short, but it’s largely an impotent rage. Europeans today have been bred to be passive, to leave things to their leaders, whose wisdom they’ve been taught all their lives to take for granted. To shake off a lifetime of this kind of indoctrination is not easy.”

According to Bat Ye’or, fear of awakening opposition to EU policy toward the Arab Mediterranean countries led to the repression of all discussion of the economic problems and difficulties of integration caused by massive immigration. Any criticism of Muslim immigration is basically brushed off as being “just like the Jews were talked about in Nazi Germany,” a ridiculous but effective statement.

Bat Ye’or agrees with Bawer’s analysis “concerning the totalitarian web cohesion of ‘teachers, professors, the media, politicians, government agency workers, talking heads on TV, the representatives of state-funded “independent” organizations like SOS Racism’ to indoctrinate the politically correct. This perfectly expresses the political directives given by the European Commission to coordinate and control in all EU member-states the political, intellectual, religious, media, teaching and publishing apparatus since the 1970s so as to harmonize with its Mediterranean strategy based on multiculturalism.”

Professional harassment, boycott and defamation punish those who dare to openly challenge the Politically Correct discourse. According to Bat Ye’or, this has led to the development of a type of “resistance press” as if Europe were under the “occupation” of its own elected governments. This free press on the Internet and in blogs has brought some changes, including the rejection of the European Constitution in 2005. Despite overwhelming support for the Constitution by the governments in France and the Netherlands and a massive media campaign by political leaders in both countries, voters rejected it. Blogs played a significant part in achieving this.

Only a few months later, EU authorities lined up together with authoritarian regimes such as Iran, Saudi Arabia, Cuba and the Chinese Communist Party in favor of “more international control with” (read: censorship of) the Internet.

According to Richard North of the EU Referendum blog, “The most dangerous form of propaganda is that which does not appear to be propaganda. And it is that form at which the BBC [the British Broadcasting Corporation] excels. Perhaps the biggest sin of all is that of omission. By simply not informing us of key issues, they go by default, unchallenged until it is too late to do anything about them.”

Vladimir Bukovsky is a former Soviet dissident, author and human rights activist who spent a total of twelve years in Soviet prisons. Now living in England, he warns against some of the same anti-democratic impulses in the West, especially in the EU, which he views as an heir to the Soviet Union. In 2002, he joined in on protests against the BBC’s compulsory TV licence. “The British people are being forced to pay money to a corporation which suppresses free speech — publicising views they don’t necessarily agree with.” He has blasted the BBC

for their “bias and propaganda,” especially in stories related to the EU or the Middle East.

Conservative MP, Michael Gove and political commentator Mark Dooley also complain about lopsided coverage: “Take, for example, the BBC’s coverage of the late Yasser Arafat. In one profile broadcast in 2002, he was lauded as an “icon” and a “hero,” but no mention was made of his terror squads, corruption, or his brutal suppression of dissident Palestinians. Similarly, when Israel assassinated the spiritual leader of Hamas, Sheikh Ahmed Yassin, in 2004, one BBC reporter described him as “polite, charming and witty, a deeply religious man.” This despite the fact that under Yassin’s guidance, Hamas murdered hundreds.”

Polish writer Nina Witoszek, now living in Norway, warns that people who have lived under Communist regimes are struck by a strange feeling of déjà vu in Western Europe:

“Before formulating a sentence, you put on a censorship autopilot which asks: Who am I insulting now? Am I too pro-Israeli, or maybe anti-Feminist, or — God forbid — anti-Islamic? Am I “progressive” enough? Soon we shall all write in a decaffeinated language: We shall obediently repeat all the benign mantras such as “dialogue,” “pluralism,” “reconciliation” and “equality.” Norway has never been a totalitarian country, but many people now feel the taste of oppression and of being muzzled. I know many wise Norwegians — and even more wise foreigners — who no longer have the energy to waste time on contributing to a castrated, paranoid democracy. We prefer safety above freedom. This is the first step towards a voluntary bondage.”

She quotes fellow writer from Poland Czeslaw Milosz, who won the Nobel Prize in Literature in 1980 for books such as The Captive Mind, where he explained the seductiveness of totalitarian ideology.

One essay by Milosz is titled “Ketman.” “Ketman” or “kitman” is an Islamic term brought to Milosz’s attention by Arthur Gobineau’s book *Religions and Philosophies of Central Asia*. He had noticed that the dissidents in Persia, long accustomed to tyranny, had evolved a style of their own. The need for survival often involved more than just keeping your mouth shut, but of actively lying in every way necessary. This strategy of dissimulation and deceit, which is especially pronounced by Shia Muslims but also used by Sunnis, is primarily used to deceive non-Muslims, but can also be used against other Muslims under duress.

According to Milosz, a very similar strategy was used in Communist countries. Similar to Islam, those practicing dissimulation felt a sense of superiority towards those who were stupid enough to state their real opinions openly. In Communist societies, dissimulation was just as much a technique of adaptation to an authoritarian regime as a conscious, theatrical form of art that became increasingly refined.

It is frightening to hear people who have grown up in former Communist countries say that they see this same totalitarian impulse at work in Western Europe now. According to them, we in the West are at least as brainwashed by Multiculturalism and Political Correctness as they ever were with Communism. It is frightening because I believe they are right. Have we witnessed the fall of the Iron Curtain in Eastern Europe only to see an Iron Veil descend on Western Europe? An Iron Veil of EU bureaucracy and Eurabian treachery, of Political Correctness, Multicultural media censorship and the ever-present threat of Muslim violence and terrorism that is gradually extinguishing free speech. The momentum of bureaucratic treachery is accelerating.

Native Europeans and indeed some non-Muslim immigrants are quietly leaving in growing numbers, gradually turning the continent into a net exporter of refugees rather than an importer of them. When large parts of Europe are being overrun by barbarians — actively aided and abetted by our own trusted leaders — and when people are banned from opposing this onslaught, is Western Europe still a meaningful part of the Free World? Have the countries of Eastern Europe gone from one “Evil Empire” to another? Are they — and we — back in the EUSSR?

Vaclav Klaus, the conservative President of the Czech Republic, has complained that: “Every time I try to remove some piece of Soviet-era regulation, I am told that whatever it is I am trying to scrap is a requirement of the European Commission.” In an interview with Paul Belien of the Brussels Journal in February 2006, Vladimir Bukovsky warned that the European Union is on its way to becoming another Soviet Union. Mr Bukovsky called the EU a “monster” that must be destroyed, the sooner the better, before it develops into a fully-fledged totalitarian state.

“The ultimate purpose of the Soviet Union was to create a new historic entity, the Soviet people, all around the



globe. The same is true in the EU today. They are trying to create a new people. They call this people “Europeans”, whatever that means. According to Communist doctrine as well as to many forms of Socialist thinking, the state, the national state, is supposed to wither away. In Russia, however, the opposite happened. Instead of withering away the Soviet state became a very powerful state, but the nationalities were obliterated. But when the time of the Soviet collapse came these suppressed feelings of national identity came bouncing back and they nearly destroyed the country. It was so frightening.”

Timothy Garton Ash is considered a leading expert on Europe’s future. Bruce Bawer views Garton Ash as typical of Europe’s political élite. Ash mistrusts national patriotism but adores the EU. He writes about the need for a factitious European patriotism (“flags, symbols, a European anthem we can sing”) to encourage “emotional identification with European institutions.” And just why does Europe need the EU? Garton Ash’s answer: “To prevent our falling back into the bad old ways of war and European barbarism.” Among his suggestions is that Europe encourage “the formation of an Arab Union.” He makes no mention of Arab democracy. Imagining “Europe in 2025 at its possible best,” he pictures it as a “partnership” with Arab countries and Russia that would extend “from Marrakesh, via Cairo, Jerusalem, Baghdad, and Tbilisi, all the way to Vladivostok.”

The European Commission proposed the controversial idea of a singing event in all member states to celebrate the European Union’s 50th “birthday,” the 50th anniversary of the 1957 Treaty of Rome. Commissioner Margot Wallstrom was lobbying for big-style birthday celebrations to “highlight the benefits that European integration has brought to its citizens.” Diplomats said the idea had sparked feelings of disgust among new, formerly Communist member states such as Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic, which were reminded of “Stalinist times” when people were forced by the state to sing. Brussels decided on a more modest celebration, also intended to spend around €300,000 on the appointment of 50 citizen “ambassadors,” dubbed the “Faces of Europe,” who are supposed to “tell their story” throughout the year on what the EU means to them in their daily life, as well as a series of activities for school children and youngsters. Germany will go ahead with its own idea to let thousands of its bakeries bake 54 sorts of cakes with recipes from all 27 member states.

Commissioner Wallstrom in 2005 argued that politicians who resisted pooling national sovereignty risked a return to Nazi horrors of the 1930s and 1940s. Her fellow commissioners also issued a joint declaration, stating that EU citizens should pay tribute to the dead of the Second World War by voting Yes to the EU Constitution. The commissioners gave the EU sole credit for ending the Cold War, making no mention of the role of NATO or the United States.

Is the EU an instrument to end wars? In October 2006, Michel Thoomis, the secretary general of the French Action Police trade union, warned of a civil war in France created by Muslim immigrants: “We are in a state of civil war, orchestrated by radical Islamists. This is not a question of urban violence any more, it is an intifada, with stones and Molotov cocktails. You no longer see two or three youths confronting police, you see whole tower blocks emptying into the streets to set their ‘comrades’ free when they are arrested.”

These Muslim immigrants were allowed in by the very same European elites who now want European citizens to celebrate their work through cakes and songs. While civil society is disintegrating in Western Europe due to Islamic pressures, EU authorities are working to increase Muslim immigration, while congratulating themselves for bringing peace to the continent. What peace? Where?

The Peace of Westphalia in 1648 ended the Thirty Years’ War, the last major religious war in Europe, and helped lay the foundations for modern nation states. Before nation states, we thus had a pattern of borderless religious wars and civil wars. This is what we have returned to, full circle, only this time a borderless Jihad is triggering civil wars in Europe. While the EU may help prevent wars between nation states with old grudges, such as Germany and France, it may also actively cause other kinds of wars. It accomplishes this by increasing Multicultural tensions and a dangerous sense of estrangement between citizens and those who are supposed to be their leaders.

Wars have existed for thousands of years before the advent of the modern nation state. It is far more likely that weakening nation states will end our democratic system, a system which is closely tied to the existence of sovereign nation states, than that it will end wars.



When asked whether the member countries of the EU joined the union voluntarily, and whether the resulting integration reflects the democratic will of Europeans, Vladimir Bukovksy replied, “No, they did not. Look at Denmark which voted against the Maastricht treaty twice. Look at Ireland [which voted against the Nice treaty]. Look at many other countries, they are under enormous pressure. It is almost blackmail. It is a trick for idiots. The people have to vote in referendums until the people vote the way that is wanted. Then they have to stop voting. Why stop? Let us continue voting. The European Union is what Americans would call a shotgun marriage.”

In 1992, Bukovksy had unprecedented access to Politburo and other Soviet secret documents, as described in his book *Judgement in Moscow*. In January 1989, during a meeting between Soviet leader Gorbachev, former Japanese Prime Minister Nakasone, former French President Valéry Giscard d’Estaing, American banker Rockefeller and former US Secretary of State Henry Kissinger, Giscard d’Estaing supposedly stated: “Europe is going to be a federal state and you have to prepare yourself for that. You have to work out with us, and the European leaders, how you would react to that.”

This was in the 1980s, when most of the media still dismissed as scaremongering any talk of a political union that would subdue the nation states. Fifteen years later, Valéry Giscard d’Estaing became the chief drafter of the truly awful EU Constitution, an impenetrable brick of a book, hundreds of pages long, and lacking any of the checks and balances so crucial to the American Constitution. Giscard has argued that the rejection of the Constitution in the French and Dutch referenda in 2005 “was a mistake which will have to be corrected” and insisted that “In the end, the text will be adopted.”

Giscard has also said that “it was a mistake to use the referendum process” because “it is not possible for anyone to understand the full text.” Does it instill confidence among the citizens of Europe that we are supposed to be under the authority of a “Constitution” that is too complex for most non-bureaucrats to understand? According to Spain’s justice minister Juan Fernando Lopez Aguilar “you don’t need to read the European constitution to know that it is good.”

Jean-Luc Dehaene, former Belgian Prime Minister, said that “We know that nine out of ten people will not have read the Constitution and will vote on the basis of what politicians and journalists say. More than that, if the answer is No, the vote will probably have to be done again, because it absolutely has to be Yes.”

Journalist Nidra Poller, however, is more skeptical. Commenting on the debate prior to the EU Constitution referendum in France, she noted a submissive attitude among EU leaders towards Muslim demands: “The Euro-Mediterranean ‘Dialogue’ is a masterpiece of abject surrender.” The European Union functions as an intermediate stage of an ominous project that calls for a meltdown of traditional European culture, to be replaced by a new, Eurabian cocktail. And she asks: “When subversive appeasement hides behind the veil of ‘Dialogue,’ what unspeakable ambitions might be dissembled by the noble word ‘Constitution’?”

The European Union gave the Palestinians \$342.8 million in aid in 2005 — or, more accurately, \$612.15 million when assistance from the 25 EU governments is included. Even the United States has repeatedly donated millions of American tax dollars to the Palestinian Authority, though not at EU levels. In July 2005, as a response to the Islamic terrorist attacks on London a few days earlier, leaders of the G8, the group of influential industrialized nations, offered the PA some \$9 billion, dubbed an “alternative to the hatred.”

The West’s largesse continued despite a demographic study in 2005 which revealed that the number showing the Palestinian population in the West Bank and Gaza had been inflated by 50% by the government.

Almost all of the new infrastructure in the Palestinian territories from the beginning of the Oslo Peace Process in the 1990s — schools, hospitals, airports — were arranged and paid for by Brussels. As Jihad was once again unleashed with the second Intifada in 2000, Israel stopped its transfer of payments to the Palestinians. So the EU stepped in with another 10 million Euros a month in direct budgetary assistance to the Palestinian Authority. EU Commissioner for External Affairs Chris Patten stated in 2002 that “there is no case for stating that EU money has financed terrorism, has financed the purchase of weapons, or any similar activities.”

However, a report by the Foundation for the Defense of Democracies later found that: “There is indisputable evidence that PA money has been used to fund terrorist activities.” This was confirmed by Fuad Shubaki, who used to serve as the finance chief in the Palestinian security forces. According to him, former Palestinian

Authority chairman Yasser Arafat ordered millions of dollars, taken from international aid funds, tax money transferred by Israel and from Arab countries, to be used to purchase weapons and ammunition, including the 50 tons of armaments on board the ship Karine A. The transaction was coordinated between the PA, Hizballah in Lebanon and the Iranian Revolutionary Guards.

In May 2006, Mahmoud Abbas — President of the Palestinian Authority after Arafat's death in November 2004 and a leading politician in Fatah — talked to the European Parliament about the peace process. At the same time, the al-Aksa Martyrs Brigades, the armed wing of Fatah, threatened to strike at US and European economic and civilian interests in response to international sanctions on the PA. Financial support evokes no gratitude in the Palestinians. However, they will threaten you with violence if aid is not forthcoming. This is plainly extortion.

This shakedown corresponds to the Muslims' view of the jizya, the tributary tax paid by non-Muslims in exchange for not being killed. Documents from the Euro-Arab Dialogue frequently mention about "financial assistance" from the EU to Arab countries. Bat Ye'or points out that some of this jizya tax is extracted from Europeans without their awareness.

In November 2005, the EU's official financial watchdog refused to approve the EU's accounts for the 11th year in a row because they were so full of fraud and errors. The European Court of Auditors refused to give a statement of assurance on the EU's \$160.3 billion budget for 2004. "The vast majority of the payment budget was again materially affected by errors of legality and regularity," it said. It specifically refused to approve the budgets for the EU's foreign policy and aid programs, many of which are geared towards Arab countries. Half the project budgets approved by the European Commission were inadequately monitored.

The European Commission is considered the EU's "government," and thus the government of nearly half a billion people. But it can release accounts with massive flaws for over a decade straight because it is largely unaccountable to anybody and was intended to be that way.

Muslims use deception to advance Jihad until it is almost too late for the infidels to stop them. The EU federalists and Eurabians have taken a page out of the Islamic playbook, and have been approaching their goals by stealth for decades, buried beneath a mass of detail and technocratic newspeak all but incomprehensible to non-bureaucrats.

In a frank moment, Jean-Claude Juncker, Luxembourg's prime minister, once described the EU's "system" in this way: "We decide on something, leave it lying around and wait and see what happens," he explained. "If no one kicks up a fuss, because most people don't understand what has been decided, we continue step by step until there is no turning back."

In *The Economist*, columnist Charlemagne writes: "What Mr Juncker and those who think like him are trying to do is, in essence, to **drown opposition to European federation in a mass of technical detail, to bore people into submission. As a strategy, it has gone a long way.** [*My emphasis*] The greatest single transfer of sovereignty from Europe's nations to the European Union took place, in 1985, as part of the project to create a single European market. Even [British Conservative PM] Margaret Thatcher, not usually slow to spot a trick, later claimed that she had not fully appreciated the ramifications of what she was then signing up to."

Writer Christopher Booker has called this the EU's "culture of deceit":

"What in fact has been taking place has been a transfer of power...to Brussels on a scale amounting to the greatest constitutional revolution in our history. But much of this has remained buried from view because our politicians like to preserve the illusion that they are still in charge. The result is that remarkably few people now have any proper understanding of how the political system which rules our lives actually works."

There are definitely certain elite groups in Europe who think that everything that's wrong with Europe is because of "populism" — what others call democracy. The motive force behind the EU aims to cede national sovereignty to a new ruling class of bureaucrats. Karl Zinsmeister notes that: "The EU apparatus is exceedingly closed and secretive. Relatively few of the confederation's important decisions are currently made by democratically accountable officials. On front after front, bureaucratic mandarins are deciding how everyday

Europeans will live. ... Many Europeans, in a way Americans find impossible to understand, are willing to let their elites lead them by the nose. There is a kind of peasant mentality under which their “betters” are allowed to make the important national judgments for them.”

MP Gisela Stuart was a member of the Praesidium which drafted the proposed EU Constitution. She sums up her experiences thus:

“The Convention brought together a self-selected group of the European political elite, many of whom have their eyes on a career at a European level, which is dependent on more and more integration, and who see national parliaments and governments as an obstacle... Not once in the sixteen months I spent on the Convention did representatives question whether deeper integration is what the people of Europe want, whether it serves their best interests or whether it provides the best basis for a sustainable structure for an expanding Union.”

In 2005, an unprecedented joint declaration by the leaders of all the British political groups in Brussels called for an end the “medieval” practice of European legislation being decided behind closed doors. Critics claim that the Council of Ministers, the EU’s supreme law-making body, which decides two thirds of all Britain’s laws, “is the only legislature outside the Communist dictatorships of North Korea and Cuba to pass laws in secret.”

According to British Conservative politician Daniel Hannan, this is how the EU was designed. “Its founding fathers understood from the first that their audacious plan to merge the ancient nations of Europe into a single polity would never succeed if each successive transfer of power had to be referred back to the voters for approval. So they cunningly devised a structure where supreme power was in the hands of appointed functionaries, immune to public opinion. Indeed, the EU’s structure is not so much undemocratic as anti-democratic.”

The European Union has been compared to the Roman Empire, but such comparisons are not very apt. Rome was the military superpower of its time, while the EU is but a military midget. However, there is one intriguing commonality: Julius Caesar was murdered because he wanted to crown himself king. This was not a popular move among the powerful elite in the Senate, who reminded Caesar that Rome had become a Republic precisely because they had rebelled against the “tyrant” kings of old.

Caesar’s successor Octavian, better known today as Caesar Augustus, is considered both the first and one of the most important Roman Emperors. He downplayed his own position by preferring the title *princeps*, usually translated as “first citizen”. He also preserved the outward form of the Roman Republic, paid lip service to the old elite, and veiled the changes to make them seem less upsetting to the public. He may have been a monarch, but he never called himself one.

Some might see a parallel in the present-day EU. When up to three-quarters of our national laws originate in Brussels, what is then the point of holding national elections? Just as in Octavian’s Rome, the real power has been moved elsewhere, but the old order is draped over reality as a democratic fig leaf in order not to upset the common people. The EU operates largely by stealth; its edicts are implemented through traditional parliaments, which are increasingly reduced to decorative appendages.

The funny aspect of this is that those who are against the EU are labelled xenophobes, nationalists or simply anti-democratic forces. The EU is an organization where unelected bureaucrats dismantle democracy, yet denounce their critics as anti-democratic forces.

In order to create this new entity, the old nation states must be deliberately crushed. Massive numbers of non-European immigrants are introduced, and the resulting situation is termed a “Multicultural society”. This demolition is followed by the demand that our entire society be changed accordingly.

Since Europeans feel less “European” than they experience themselves as French, Italian, Dutch, etc., national allegiances have to be broken down. At the same time, an external rival must be created. The closest model is Bismarck’s unification of Germany. The numerous German states rallied to Prussia’s side against the French in the Franco-Prussian War in 1870, thus paving the way for a new, powerful German federation.

The EU federalists strive to build a united European state through a shared animosity against the USA, while constructing a Eurabian entity of Europe and the Arab world via their common hostility towards Israel. One tactic is the deliberate use of the media to whip up anger against these countries and to demonize them.

However, Bismarck's German states were united by a common language. Even if a "new us" could be constructed from dozens of nations — which is highly questionable — melding various ethnic groups into a cohesive nation takes centuries. Without a shared identity, without a European demos, how can the EU be anything but authoritarian? Perhaps the EU elites believe that a large mass of people lacking a distinct cultural identity would be easier to control?

The problem is that the nation state itself has been declared evil or obsolete, not collectivism, anti-individualism or totalitarianism. But there is a crucial distinction between nationalism and patriotism, which George Orwell saw clearly:

*"Nationalism is not to be confused with patriotism. By 'patriotism' I mean devotion to a particular place and a particular way of life, which one believes to be the best in the world but has no wish to force on other people. Patriotism is of its nature defensive, both militarily and culturally. Nationalism, on the other hand, is inseparable from the desire for power."*

Totalitarian regimes can be national, such as Nazi Germany, but they can also be supranational, such as the Soviet Union, which sought to suppress all pre-existing national loyalties.

How was a project as big as the creation of Eurabia pulled off? I have thought a lot about this question, and come to the conclusion that it succeeded precisely because of its size. St. Augustine tells the story of a pirate captured by Alexander the Great. "How dare you molest the sea?" asked Alexander. "How dare you molest the whole world?" the pirate replied. "Because I do it with a little ship only, I am called a thief; you, doing it with a great navy, are called an emperor."

It's a matter of scale. If a small group of people sideline the democratic process in one country and start imposing their own laws on the public, it's called a coup d'état. If they do so on an entire continent, it's called the European Union.

Adolf Hitler's autobiography *Mein Kampf* described a propaganda technique known as "the Big Lie". The EU has adopted this strategy, which consists of telling a lie so "colossal" that it would be impossible to believe anyone "could have the impudence to distort the truth so infamously." This has been combined with the technique, perfected by Propaganda Minister Joseph Goebbels in Nazi Germany, of repeating a point until it is taken to be the truth.

Here are some Big Lies:

- Diversity is always good;
- Multiculturalism is inevitable, as is continued EU integration;
- Those opposing it are ignorant racists standing against the tide of history;
- Muslim immigration is "good for the economy" and is necessary for funding the welfare state in the future, despite the fact that it drains away enormous resources.

The creation of Eurabia ranks as one of the greatest betrayals in the history of Western civilization. Does that mean that all EU federalists or those who participate in the various instruments of the Euro-Arab Dialogue are evil? No, reality isn't that simple. As Hugh Fitzgerald points out, "A whole class of people has gotten rich from Arab money and bribes; lawyers, public relations men, and diplomats, journalists, university teachers and assorted officials."

However, while ignorance, corruption and the self-serving search for personal power explains some of the behavior of the Eurabian elites, it cannot explain the behavior of ALL those thousands of people who have been involved in these networks. Some of them must have convinced themselves that what they were doing

was for a just cause, if for no other reason than because human vanity demands that we justify our actions by covering them with a veneer of goodness.

In the science fiction movie *Serenity*, the two great superpowers, the United States and China, have merged into the Alliance, which has moved humanity to a new star system. On the little-known planet Miranda, a gas called Pax was added to the air processors. It was intended to calm the population, weed out aggression. It worked. The people stopped fighting. They also stopped doing everything else, including breeding and physical self-preservation. A small minority of the population had the opposite reaction to this pacification. Their aggression increased beyond madness, and they killed most of the others. Tens of millions of people quietly let themselves be wiped out.

Movie director Joss Whedon is careful to point out that the Alliance isn't some evil empire, but rather a force that is largely benevolent. They meant it for the best, to create a better world, a world without sin. However, according to Whedon, "Whenever you create Utopia, you find something ugly working underneath it."

Former Europeans who fought against Jihad fought *for* a number of things: Their religion, their culture and their nation. EU federalists and Eurabians are deliberately suppressing all of these instincts in their quest to create a New Man and weed out aggression. However, because they have wrongly identified the nation state as the root cause of all evil, they are suppressing not just aggressive nationalism, but defensive patriotism. And since some of the Muslims have actually become even more aggressive in response to what they perceive as our nihilism, the Eurabians have suicidally disarmed their own people, literally and metaphorically, and put them up for slaughter.

Many Communists, at least in the beginning, really believed in their ideology. The result was mass slaughter; tens of millions of people were killed in the quest for a world without oppression or exploitation. The road to Hell is paved with good intentions. Regardless of how good your intentions may be, you cannot use millions of people as guinea pigs in massive social experiments without causing massive harm.

Perhaps one of the reasons why this has been allowed to happen in Western Europe and the European Union is because we never fully understood or attempted to confront the reasons for the abysmal failure of Communism in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union following the Cold War. The concept of massive social experiments to create a New Man was allowed to survive. It mutated and then migrated West. Jean Monnet, who set in motion the process of European integration, reflected on how the European civil service constituted a 'laboratory' in which a new kind of 'European Man' would be born. But the New European Man, just like the New Soviet Man before him, is all but certain to fail.

Can the European Union be reformed? I doubt it. The EU is bound together by a self-serving class of bureaucrats who want to expand their budgets and their power, despite the harm they do. These functionaries will use traditional methods of deception to counteract any calls for reforms so they can retain control.

It is instructive to watch the reactions of the EU elites to the popular rejections in France and Holland of the EU Constitution in 2005. They put together a "wise" group of European politicians, led by Giuliano Amato, Italian Interior Minister in "super-Eurabian" Romano Prodi's government, to come up with possible solutions to this impasse. Suggestions discussed included dropping the name "constitution" in favor of "treaty."

The same Amato, who is a former Italian Prime Minister and also the Vice-President of the EU Convention which drafted the Constitution, has earlier stated that:

"In Europe one needs to act 'as if' — as if what was wanted was little, in order to obtain much, as if states were to remain sovereign to convince them to concede sovereignty... The Commission in Brussels, for example, should act as if it were a technical instrument, in order to be able to be treated as a government. And so **only disguise and subterfuge** [*my emphasis*]."

That a man who has openly bragged about how EU federalist goals are advanced by "disguise and subterfuge" leads the attempts to "renew" the EU Constitution tells ordinary Europeans everything we need to know about the EU. If the EU elites have deliberately deceived us for decades to achieve their goals, why should we suddenly trust them now? Fool me once, shame on you. Fool me twice, shame on me. These people have fooled us enough.



“I think that the European Union, like the Soviet Union, cannot be democratized,” says Vladimir Bukovksy. “There will be a collapse of the European Union pretty much like the Soviet Union collapsed. But do not forget that when these things collapse they leave such devastation that it takes a generation to recover...Look to the huge number of immigrants from Third World countries now living in Europe. This was promoted by the European Union. What will happen with them if there is an economic collapse? We will probably have, like in the Soviet Union at the end, so much ethnic strife that the mind boggles.”

In their book about the EU, Richard North and Christopher Booker conclude: “The project Monnet had set on its way was a vast, ramshackle, self-deluding monster: partly suffocating in its own bureaucracy; partly a corrupt racket...The one thing above all the project could never be, because by definition it had never been intended to be, was in the remotest sense democratic.” They believe the EU is doomed and will “leave a terrible devastation behind it, a wasteland from which it would take many years for the peoples of Europe to emerge.”

I understand concerns that the destruction of the EU could cause “instability” in Europe. It will. But we will probably end up with “instability” anyway, given the number of Muslims the Eurabians have let in. The choice is between a period of painful years in which most of Europe prevails, and death, where Europe simply ceases to exist as a Western cultural entity.

Some would hope that we could keep the “positive” aspects of the EU and not “throw out the baby with the bath water.” I beg to differ.

The EU is all bath water, no baby. There never was a baby, just a truckload of overpaid babysitters.

Across Western Europe, Muslim immigrants tend to settle in major cities, with the native population retreating into the countryside. This destruction of the coherence of society is triggering a return to tribalism, as people no longer trust the nation state to protect them.

The process has been explained by Ernest Baert: “Over many centuries, Western Europe has replaced the tribe or clan by the nation state.” The result was that “European citizens tend to have equal trust in all other citizens of the same nation state outside their immediate family and circle of friends.” This “high-trust society” was a necessary precondition not only for the success of a capitalist economy in Europe, but also for the rise of democracy.

A different worldview prevails in the Muslim world or in Africa. There, individuals have no choice but to fall back on their clan for protection. So what effect will the introduction of massive numbers of individuals from “low-trust societies” have on our own culture? Baert is pessimistic:

“There is little doubt that we live in the dying days of the multicultural fantasy. It will end in misery and may lead to the loss of Europe as a part of Western civilisation. Our children and grandchildren will look back to our days and wonder why so many so easily accepted what patently contradicted history and common sense.”

While ordinary Europeans live in fear of Muslim violence in their own cities and trust in their own leaders is plummeting, EU elites meet in cocktail parties and congratulate each other for bringing peace to Europe.

The European Union promised a Brave New World where wars and ethnic rivalries were a thing of the past. Will it deliver barbarism? Maybe that's what Utopias tend to do.



## The Eurabia Code — 2008 Updates

*This essay was published at The Brussels Journal in October 2008. It is republished here with some additions from late October.*

My essay *The Eurabia Code* was published in 2006, inspired by Bat Ye'or's groundbreaking book *Eurabia: The Euro-Arab Axis*. I have chosen to reproduce *The Eurabia Code* almost unchanged above but will include some updates here. The rest of this book was completed during the first half of October 2008. I decided to add some information to this chapter on October 25 because during just two weeks in mid-October, a series of disturbing news about the rapid progress of Eurabia were published. Much of this information has, as usual, been little mentioned in the mainstream press, but that doesn't mean that it's a complete secret. One of the news websites dedicated to following the Euro-Mediterranean cooperation is ANSAMED ([www.ansamed.info](http://www.ansamed.info)). Here is a quote from [ANSAMED](#) from October 13 2008:

“The Euro-Mediterranean Parliamentary Assembly (EMPA) has asked the foreign ministers of the Union for the Mediterranean (UfM) for more powers as well as the legal basis to sanction its role as their political arm. At a special meeting of the EMPA in Amman, representatives of the parliaments from both sides of the Mediterranean have approved a document to submit to the Euro-Med foreign ministers, who will meet in Marseille on 3 and 4 November: ‘we will ask ministers to make EMPA an integral part of the UfM, in terms of its parliamentary dimension’. The ministers of the UpM must provide the deputies of EMPA — led by the President of the EU Parliament, Hans Gert Poettering — with ‘a legal basis, setting the nature and the timescale of meetings between the two institutions’. EMPA intends to carry out ‘the role of consultant’, which is not binding, but obliges the ministers and heads of state of the UfM to take note of their resolutions and recommendations on the agenda of their meetings.”

The Euro-Mediterranean Parliamentary Assembly (EMPA), which is mentioned in *The Eurabia Code* from 2006, includes politicians from Arab countries in addition to European ones. This institution will now gradually be granted more powers, presumably including some legislative powers. At the same time as the EU is diminishing the legislative powers of elected parliaments in European nation states, it is working to grant legislative powers to Arab countries, which means that Jordan, Egypt and Algeria will soon be in a position to directly influence legislation in Hungary, Ireland, Austria and Sweden. Here is another quote from [ANSAMED](#), also from October 13 2008:

“The two shores of the Mediterranean are even closer, thanks to a political step taken today by the European Union which granted an ‘advanced association status’ to Morocco, a recognition from Brussels for the reforms carried out in the past years by the north-African kingdom. The agreement, the first special association status granted by the EU to a third country, was ratified today by the EU Foreign Affairs Council of Ministers, with the presence of French Foreign Minister Bernard Kouchner, and the Moroccan plenipotentiary, Taieb Fassi Fihri.” Moreover, “Morocco will be admitted to participate in some of the meetings of EU institutions (for example, the EU Foreign Affairs Council of Ministers) and various European agencies: Europol, Eurojust, the European agency for air safety and the observatory on drugs and drug addicts. From the EU's perspective, it will be able to increase its economic aid to Rabat, which is already the top beneficiary of European funds for neighbouring countries with 657 million euro in the period of 2007-2010.”

Morocco, as the first but not the last Arab country, is gradually being welcomed into the EU. What has happened since 2006 is that European leaders are increasingly open about the idea of enlarging the EU to include the Arab world, although they do of course not present this as surrendering the continent to Islam. This hasn't been totally secret previously. For instance, in 2002 Louis Michel, the then Belgian minister of foreign affairs and later a member of the European Commission, [told the Belgian parliament](#) that the EU will eventually encompass North Africa and the Middle East.

-----  
Why go public with this now? My theory is that EU leaders consider their people to be defeated. We are serfs. After the implementation of the Lisbon Treaty/European Constitution, the people no longer have a say and can safely be ignored. They have held us in contempt for years and no longer care to hide this. We are sheep and constitute no threat while they must continue appeasing the Muslims.

Open plans for a “[Mediterranean Union](#)” or “Union for the Mediterranean,” which will include all EU

member states, Mauritania, Morocco, Algeria, Tunisia, Libya, Egypt, Jordan, the Palestinian Authority, Lebanon, Syria and Turkey, was launched in mid-2008, under some concern among Arabs that this might normalize their relationship with Israel. This came with plans for the creation of a “north-south co-presidency” and a permanent secretariat as well as the definition of a “short-list” of priority projects for the region. The European Commission proposes the creation of a co-presidency between the EU and a Mediterranean (Muslim) country, chosen for a two-year term. Brussels is currently drawing the institutional profile of what will be called “Barcelona Process — A Union for the Mediterranean.” Notice how they tie this to the Eurabian Barcelona Process launched in the 1990s and described by Bat Ye’or.

Despite this, even after the Mediterranean Union was proclaimed, I still heard claims that any talk of Eurabia was a “dangerous Islamophobic conspiracy theory.” As of late 2008, it is simply no longer possible to claim this. Eurabia is out in the open and Bat Ye’or has been proven right: Western European leaders are now implementing agreements with Arabs that were made many years ago, perhaps decades ago. Native Europeans have not been asked whether they want their countries to be flooded with Muslims. “Democracy” is totally irrelevant here; it may even generate passivity among the natives because it maintains the illusion that they still have a say regarding their future. In reality, agreements about opening the continent to Muslims were made a long time ago. Voting for another national leader may at best slow down the pace of implementation, but not stop it, as long as the EU exists. The real decisions are made behind closed doors by EU organs that are above democratic control, and later forced down people’s throats.

As journalist Nick Fagge stated in British newspaper the *Daily Express* in October 2008, more than 50 million African workers are to be invited to Europe in a far-reaching migration deal. The aim is to promote “free movement of people in Africa and the EU.” Since the few remaining Europeans in Africa face increasing harassment and it is unlikely that many Europeans will want to settle in Mali, this “free movement” will actually mean “free movement of Africans from countries with unsustainable population growth to Europe.” EU officials are inviting other peoples to colonize their countries and overwhelm the natives. This happens at a time when there are plans to build hundreds of large mosques throughout Europe.

The multilingual EU-focused magazine Café Babel in October 2008 posted an interview with Jacques Barrot, the vice president of the European Commission. Barrot belongs to the same party as the current French President Sarkozy and was a supporter of former President Jacques Chirac. According to Barrot, “The demographic situation of Europe means a need for focused migration. Europe’s vocation is also to facilitate exchanges between countries. Immigration is both an economic and moral obligation.”

Notice how Europeans “have to” accept mass immigration of tens of millions of people from Africa and the Middle East. Does he see any problem with Islam? No, he does not: “This way of seeing Islam as antagonist to European values is totally partial and erroneous. Islam is a monotheistic religion that appears to me to be compatible with our secular principles. What it isn’t, is all the fundamentalists, not only Islamic, who want to segregate and exclude other religions. Once pluralism is accepted by Islam, in Europe at least, Islam is welcome.”

Mr. Barrot fails to explain exactly where Muslims have ever accepted pluralism, or whether this is even theoretically possible according to Islamic doctrines. In my view, it clearly isn’t.

In mid-October, President Nicolas Sarkozy called Arabic the “language of the future, of science and of modernity. We must invest in the Arabic language (because) teaching it symbolizes a moment of exchange, of openness and of tolerance, (and it) brings with it one of the oldest and most prestigious civilizations of the world.” “France is a friend of Arabic countries. We are not seeking a clash between the East and West,” he affirmed, emphasizing the strong presence of Arab leaders at the founding summit of the Mediterranean Union in July 2008. Mr. Sarkozy had earlier cultivated an image as a “tough guy” who would stand up to the violence and harassment by immigrants against native Frenchmen. As soon as he was elected President, he turned out to be just another passionate Eurabian.

In a letter appearing in the respected Italian newspaper *Corriere della Sera*, former Italian President Francesco Cossiga in 2008 revealed that the government of Italy in the 1970s agreed to allow Arab terrorist groups freedom of movement in the country in exchange for immunity from attacks. The government of the late PM Aldo Moro reached a “secret non-belligerence pact between the Italian state and Palestinian resistance organizations, including terrorist groups.” According to the former president, it was Moro himself who

designed the terms of the agreement with the Arab terrorists. “The terms of the agreement were that the Palestinian organizations could even maintain armed bases of operation in the country, and they had freedom of entry and exit without being subject to normal police controls, because they were ‘handled’ by the secret services.” As Interior Minister, Cossiga said that he learned PLO members in Italy had diplomatic immunity as representatives of the Arab League. “The Palestinian organizations could even maintain armed bases of operation in the country.”

This was the formal birth of Eurabia, when Western European governments, giving in to pressure from Arab terrorists and oil-producing states, abandoned their traditional pro-Israeli position and gradually aligned themselves with the Arab-Islamic world. There is absolutely no reason to assume that the Italians were the only ones to make such “deals.” In addition to cultural and political cooperation, European governments have agreed to pay Arabs, Palestinians in particular, large sums in “protection money” to reduce the terrorist threat. This can only be seen as *jizya*, and the practice has later spread to the entire European Union, which pays the Palestinians tens of millions if not hundreds of millions of Euros annually.

The MEDA programme, the principal financial instrument for the implementation of the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership, during 2000-2006 spent €5,350 million on its various programs, according to the EU’s official website. During the period 1995-1999, some 86% of the resources allocated to MEDA were channelled to Algeria, Egypt, Jordan, Lebanon, Morocco, Syria, Tunisia, Turkey and the Palestinian Authority.

From 2007, MEDA was replaced by the European Neighbourhood and Partnership Instrument, which over the period 2007 to 2013 is projected to spend €11 billion on, among other things, promoting cooperation between European and Arab countries in the sectors of energy and transport; in higher education and mobility of teachers, researchers and students; Multicultural dialogue through people-to-people contacts, including links with communities of immigrants living in EU countries as well as cooperation between civil societies, cultural institutions and exchanges of young people. The European Commission, the EU’s powerful government with extensive legislative powers, shall coordinate cooperation with non-governmental organizations (NGOs), universities, churches, religious associations and the media in matters related to this project; all according to documents available on the Internet, yet almost unknown to the general public since the mainstream media rarely mention them.

I got some critical comments to my original *Eurabia Code*, among them a claim that The Algiers Declaration for a Shared Vision of the Future from 2006, which I mentioned, is not signed by any official EU body. However, the Anna Lind Euro-Mediterranean Foundation for the dialogue between cultures which organized this is linked to from the official EU website as a part of the EU’s external relations programs and the Euro — Mediterranean Partnership. Some of the organizations that participate in this may technically be independent organizations, but there is no doubt that the European Commission constitutes the driving force behind these networks. Moreover, if you read these documents closely, you will find that they mention “harmonization of the education systems” between Europe and the Arab world. This requires the involvement of the authorities at the highest level, not just NGOs.

The declaration states that “It is essential to create a Euro-Mediterranean entity founded on Universal Values.” The phrase “universal values” may sound innocent, but who decides which values are universal? I have heard the “moderate” Muslim Tariq Ramadan, who has served as an adviser to various EU organs, state that the only universal values are Islamic values. This sentiment is generally shared by Muslims. Arabs participating in the Euro-Arab Dialogue will interpret this statement from the Algiers Declaration and similar documents as an admission that the EU agrees to create a European-Arab entity based on Islam.

In September 2008, a brief statement in a few media outlets in Denmark (I’ve seen remarkably little mention of this far-reaching proposal in the mainstream media in most European countries) said that Muslims living in the EU will in future be able to divorce according to sharia law. This is the belief of the EU Commission, which recommends that a couple should be able to choose which country’s law they will follow — as long as they have some connection to the country they choose. Danish People’s Party spokesman Morten Messerschmidt was greatly concerned about the proposal: “It’s a completely lamebrain idea, the possibility that the Commission will use inhumane sharia laws in the EU,” he said.

What most people don’t understand is that this is part of long-term deals that have already been agreed upon by EU leaders. Virtually all Western European leaders have surrendered. There is no longer a question of

whether or not sharia will be officially accepted as law (as it has been for Muslims living in Britain); it is only a question of how to implement this.

Meanwhile, a [European Arrest Warrant](#) lists a number of serious crimes, including terrorism, armed robbery, rape, and racism and xenophobia, which are punishable throughout the EU. The European Arrest Warrant requires that anyone who is charged by a member state under the listed group of offenses (which could cover just about anything) may be arrested by the authorities of the issuing state within any interference of the other member state. The accused must then be transited for trial to the issuing state within ten days, without any interference, judicial or otherwise, by the executing state.

Racism includes “[Islamophobia](#),” according to EU documents, which means that “Islamophobia” could soon be treated as a serious crime across the European continent. At the same time, EU leaders are busy enlarging the EU to include North Africa and the Middle East, thus flooding Europe with tens of millions of additional Muslims. Not far into the future, we can imagine a situation where the authorities can arrest a person in, say, Denmark or Italy, who has published a cartoon that could be considered offensive to Islam. He or she could then be handed over to the authorities in Algeria, Egypt or Jordan.

Remember that blasphemy against Islam carries the death penalty according to sharia. Multiculturalism in Europe is about to reach its openly totalitarian phase. Those who think this is a joke can look at the Dutch cartoonist Gregorius Neckshot who was arrested in 2008 for cartoons that “insulted” Muslims. Several documents that are publicly available (but little known to the general public because they are never referred to by the mainstream media) state that the EU should “harmonize” the education and legal systems with the Arab “partner countries” within the coming decade. This is being negotiated as we speak, behind our backs.

[European Commission](#) president José Manuel Barroso earlier expressed unease with the prospect of a second Dutch Lisbon Treaty/European Constitution referendum. “Referendums make the process of approval of European treaties much more complicated and less predictable,” he said, asking “every member state” considering a referendum to “think twice.” Mr Barroso in his previous job as Portuguese Prime Minister in 2004 backed a referendum on the EU constitution in his own country — but since then his thinking has changed. “I was in favour of a referendum as a prime minister, but it does make our lives with 27 member states in the EU more difficult. If a referendum had been held on the creation of the European Community or the introduction of the euro, do you think these would have passed?”

According to [The Sunday Times](#) from October 18 2008, plans to isolate Ireland and force the country to hold a second referendum on the Lisbon treaty by March 2009 were discussed at an EU meeting. Key French politicians and other MEPs said that Ireland should be put in an “untenable position” by pressing Poland and the Czech Republic to ratify the treaty by December. The meeting heard how Ireland’s “intellectual mediocrity and lack of political courage” led to the rejection of the Lisbon Treaty and included discussions of how to “cuddle and pamper” the Irish voter ahead of a new vote while at the same time “making pressures on them.”

French politicians want to tell the Irish people how the other 495 million Europeans “will be really angry” if the answer is no again. Never mind that most Europeans were never allowed a chance to vote on the EU Constitution/Lisbon Treaty, which had earlier been rejected by French and Dutch voters. Jacques Delors, the powerful former European Commission president, warned that Europe (which is Eurocrat speak for the European Union; “Europe” and the EU are always used as synonyms) should be wary of conceding to Ireland on Lisbon.

According to the Irish Election blog from October 19 2008, [Brussels’](#) view of Ireland after the referendum on the Lisbon Treaty was rather hostile:

“Ireland, they said, signed off on this as a government and failed to deliver. True the Irish people were asked but nearly all of the EU people we spoke to lamented the Yes campaign for being incompetent and half hearted. The views ranged from disappointment that the Irish government ran such a pathetic campaign, to near contempt for the Irish government’s incompetence, to one outright claim that [Irish PM] [Brian Cowen](#) should have resigned after failing to convince the Irish people on the deal which he was instrumental in brokering. And yes, when questioned about the French No, the speaker said [former French President] Chirac should have gone too.”



In the EU capital, national leaders are no longer supposed to follow the will of their people. The Irish Prime Minister, for instance, is viewed as a low-level bureaucrat of the EU system who should follow orders from his superiors in Brussels, not from his own electorate. These are the same people who champion mass immigration of Muslims to Europe. Through the Lisbon Treaty/European Constitution they can remove the final obstacles to the implementation of their Eurabian policies. In a sane world, these individuals would stand trial for crimes against their people instead of having well-paid jobs for subverting their interests.

Let's sum up our findings: The EU has accepted that the Union should gradually be enlarged to include the Muslim Middle East and North Africa. The EU has accepted that tens of millions of immigrants from predominantly Muslim countries in northern Africa should be allowed to settle in Europe in the years ahead. This is supposedly "good for the economy." It is planning to implement sharia laws for the millions of Muslims it is inviting to settle in Europe. It has passed stronger anti-racism laws while making clear that "Islamophobia" constitutes a form of racism and is cooperating with Islamic countries on rewriting school textbooks to provide a "positive" image of Islam to European children. Finally, the EU is developing an Arrest Warrant which stipulates that those charged with serious crimes, for instance racism, can be arrested without undue interference of the nation state they happen to live in. In essence, **the European Union is formally surrendering an entire continent to Islam while destroying established national cultures, and is prepared to harass those who disagree with these policies. This constitutes the greatest organized betrayal in Western history, perhaps in human history,** yet it is hailed as a victory for "tolerance."

José Manuel Barroso, the leader of the unaccountable government for half a billion people, has stated that the EU is an empire. Maybe we think it's ridiculous to see the EU as an empire, but his statement shows that some people in leading positions do think like this. It would make sense to remember that all empires have been created through war. If the EU is an empire, this means that a war is being waged against somebody. And it is: A cultural and demographic war waged against native Europeans. Whereas empires are normally created by waging a war against other peoples, the EU is the first empire in history created by leaders allowing other peoples to wage a war against their own people. Mass immigration is used to crush all nation states simultaneously so that the natives have no place to flee to and no country can come to the aid of others against the advancing Islamization. I suspect that the ideologies of Globalism, Multiculturalism and Eurabianism, which are imposed from above, will in the future be viewed as pure evil, and I fear that they could plunge the European continent into war, just like Nazism did.

The European Union — or the Eurabian Empire — is a power grab by the elites intended to dismantle the nations they are supposed to serve. Instead of being mere servants of the people in smaller countries, they aspire to become members of an unaccountable elite ruling a vast empire. This is why they continue to promote mass immigration as if nothing has happened even as native Europeans get blown up, raped, mugged and murdered in their own cities. They are generals on a warpath. Ordinary citizens are just cannon fodder, pawns to be sacrificed in a giant game of political chess in their quest for more personal power, a recreation of the Roman Empire designed to make up for the declining international influence of European nation states. Alternatively, some of them truly believe their own lies about creating a new, enlightened and peaceful world order, or they are blackmailed and/or bribed by Arab Muslims. The truth is most likely a combination of several explanations, but their motivation is anyway of secondary importance. The crucial thing is to realize that leaders in the Western half of Europe, and increasingly in the Eastern half as well, are dedicated to dismantling their own nations.

Finally, we should remember one thing: All of this started with the appeasement of Arab bullies in the 1970s who used oil and terrorism as weapons. Europeans should work to get rid of the culture of betrayal, but we also need to get rid of the culture of appeasement that brought us in this mess. No money for the Palestinians; not one cent. If they need money, they can ask Saudi Arabia. And no more appeasement of Islamic terrorists. It was "dialogue," the Euro-Arab Dialogue, that created this situation in the first place. Dialogue is thus the cause of our problems, not the solution to them. No more "dialogue" with the Jihadist enemy. The only way to deal with a bully is to punch him in the nose and make him back down, and the only way to do that is to have credible military forces and the will to use them. Relying on diplomacy alone doesn't give you "soft power," it only makes you soft and invites external aggression.

## The Muslim Brotherhood's Infiltration of the West

*This essay was first published at the website Jihad Watch in February 2008. It is republished here with some changes.*

The Muslim Brotherhood, today widely regarded as the largest Islamic movement in the world, was founded by Hassan al-Banna in 1928. Its member groups are dedicated to the motto: "Allah is our objective. The Prophet is our leader. The Qur'an is our law. Jihad is our way. Dying in the way of Allah is our highest hope."

Research analyst Lorenzo Vidino writes about The Muslim Brotherhood's Conquest of Europe: "Since the early 1960s, Muslim Brotherhood members and sympathizers have moved to Europe and slowly but steadily established a wide and well-organized network of mosques, charities, and Islamic organizations." Their ultimate goal "may not be simply 'to help Muslims be the best citizens they can be,' but rather to extend Islamic law throughout Europe and the United States. With moderate rhetoric and well-spoken German, Dutch, and French, they have gained acceptance among European governments and media alike. Politicians across the political spectrum rush to engage them whenever an issue involving Muslims arises or, more parochially, when they seek the vote of the burgeoning Muslim community. But, speaking Arabic or Turkish before their fellows Muslims, they drop their facade and embrace radicalism."

Moreover, "While the Muslim Brotherhood and their Saudi financiers have worked to cement Islamist influence over Germany's Muslim community, they have not limited their infiltration to Germany. Thanks to generous foreign funding, meticulous organization, and the naïveté of European elites, Muslim Brotherhood-linked organizations have gained prominent positions throughout Europe. In France, the extremist Union des Organisations Islamiques de France (Union of Islamic Organizations of France) has become the predominant organization in the government's Islamic Council. In Italy, the extremist Unione delle Comunità ed Organizzazioni Islamiche in Italia (Union of the Islamic Communities and Organizations in Italy) is the government's prime partner in dialogue regarding Italian Islamic issues."

The irony, according to Vidino, is that "Muslim Brotherhood founder Hassan al-Banna dreamed of spreading Islamism throughout Egypt and the Muslim world. He would never have dreamed that his vision might also become a reality in Europe."

One of the Brotherhood's first pioneers in Europe was Sa'id Ramadan. According to the Middle East Media Research Institute (MEMRI), Sa'id Ramadan, who was al-Banna's son-in-law, joined the Muslim Brotherhood in his youth. At the age of 20, Hassan al-Banna chose Sa'id to be his personal secretary and sent him to Palestine to establish a branch of the movement there. After World War II, when Mufti Haj Amin al-Husseini returned to Palestine, Sa'id Ramadan helped him to form military groups for the struggle against the Jews. Al-Husseini was an active accomplice in the Holocaust and visited leading Nazis repeatedly. Terrorist organization Hamas is the Palestinian branch of the MB today.

After Hassan al-Banna's assassination in 1949, Sa'id Ramadan returned to Egypt and became a leader of the Muslim Brotherhood. In 1954 he went to Jerusalem with another leading Brotherhood member, Sayyid Qutb, in order to participate in the World Islamic Conference, and was elected conference secretary-general.

In the late 1950s, Sa'id Ramadan managed to persuade Saudi Prince Faisal to help him establish Islamic centers in Europe's main capitals. In 1958, he settled in Geneva and there founded the Islamic Center, which became the headquarters of Muslim Brotherhood members expelled from Egypt. In 1964, he opened Islamic centers in London and Munich, and became the leader of the Muslim Brotherhood abroad.

The oil-rich kingdom of Saudi Arabia has for years granted an influx of money to the powerful Islamic Center of Geneva, Switzerland, now run by Sa'id's son Hani Ramadan. He was made infamous by a 2002 article in the French daily *Le Monde* defending the stoning of adulterers to death. His brother Tariq Ramadan, a career "moderate Muslim," later called for a "moratorium" on stoning. In 2008 it was announced that Hani Ramadan would receive SFr255,000, the equivalent of two years' salary, in damages from the canton of Geneva. He was sacked in 2004 after defending the stoning of persons guilty of adultery. An appeal commission of the education department sided with Ramadan, annulling the termination. The government also agreed to pay Ramadan's legal fees.



It was the Muslim Brotherhood's spiritual leader Yusuf al-Qaradawi, a follower of Hassan al-Banna in his youth, who directed the prayer at Sa'id Ramadan's funeral in 1995, as Tariq Ramadan proudly reports. Sa'id Ramadan had close contacts with Brotherhood member Sayyid Qutb, whose writings have inspired countless Jihadists around the world, for instance terrorist leader Osama bin Laden. According to writer Paul Berman, Ramadan "not only knew Qutb; he was, at the crucial moment, Qutb's most important supporter in the world of the Egyptian intellectuals. Said Ramadan was the editor who got Qutb started on what became his most important work."

According to Dr. Ahmad Al-Rab'i, former Kuwaiti minister of education, "The beginnings of all of the religious terrorism that we are witnessing today were in the Muslim Brotherhood's ideology of *takfir* [accusing other Muslims of apostasy]. Sayyid Qutb's book *Milestones* was the inspiration and the guide for all of the *takfir* movements that came afterwards. The founders of the violent groups were raised on the Muslim Brotherhood, and those who worked with Bin Laden and Al-Qa'ida went out under the mantle of the Muslim Brotherhood."

Tariq Ramadan, the grandson of the founder of the Muslim Brotherhood, says decadent Europe will give way to an Islamized Europe. In the 21st century, "The West will begin its new decline, and the Arab-Islamic world its renewal" and ascent to seven centuries of world domination after seven centuries of decline. "Only Islam can achieve the synthesis between Christianity and humanism, and fill the spiritual void that afflicts the West." All good people are implicitly Muslims "because true humanism is founded in Koranic revelations." In a clash with Ayaan Hirsi Ali, the Dutch-Somali critic of Islam, Ramadan said it was wrong to say that Europe had a Judeo-Christian past. "Islam is a European religion. The Muslims came here after the first and second world wars to rebuild Europe, not to colonise."

Danish theologian Kirsten Sarauw writes in her article A Declaration of War Against the People of Europe that in 2007 in Vienna, Austria, a conference was held about so-called Euro-Islam. Prominent Muslim delegates formulated a strategic vision of a Europe dominated by Islam. Mustafa Ceric, Grand Mufti of Bosnia, envisioned an "upcoming Islamic era." The conference was in agreement about the first and foremost goal, namely the introduction of religious Islamic jurisprudence (sharia) in Europe, "in the beginning at least as a parallel system alongside national laws in European states." As to the real meaning of sharia, they all agreed to avoid publicity as far as possible. According to Sarauw, Tariq Ramadan proclaimed that the real intentions of this work must be concealed from the general public.

In 2007 it was announced that Tariq Ramadan was to hold the Sultan of Oman chair of Islamology at the University of Leiden. Leiden is the oldest university in the Netherlands, founded in the sixteenth century by Prince William of Orange, the leader of the Dutch struggle for independence. Dutch Education and Culture Minister Ronald Plasterk said that he did not object to Ramadan's appointment. Meanwhile, the Amsterdam city council, dominated by the Dutch Labor Party which receives many Muslim votes, developed teaching material warning school children against the opinions of Dutch Islam critic Geert Wilders.

The European Council for Fatwa and Research, headed by Muslim Brotherhood spiritual leader Yusuf al-Qaradawi, is working on a Muslim Constitution for Europe that will be above national legislation. According to Tina Magaard from the University of Aarhus, behind these ambitions "lies decades of work." Islamic groups have for years aimed at establishing their control over the Muslim communities, and in some cases have won official recognition from government bodies. According to Magaard, "The Imams and Islamists consider the cooperation with the state institutions a transfer of power. Now it is they who rule."

Former Muslim Dr. Patrick Sookhdeo, author of the excellent book "Global Jihad — The future in the face of Militant Islam," warns that the Islamization going on in European cities is not happening by chance. It "is the result of a careful and deliberate strategy by certain Muslim leaders which was planned in 1980 when the Islamic Council of Europe published a book called *Muslim Communities in Non-Muslim States*." The instructions told Muslims to get together into viable communities, set up mosques, community centres and Islamic schools. To resist assimilation, they must group themselves geographically in areas of high Muslim concentration. According to Sookhdeo, the ultimate goal is Islamic rule in Europe.

Yusuf al-Qaradawi is backed by Saudi money and founded the major English language website IslamOnline, which has several hundred full-time employees and serves as an international outlet for his teachings. He is

also leader of the European Council for Fatwa and Research, which spreads its rulings on sharia-related matters to mosques across Europe. He is based in Qatar, home to the influential Arabic satellite TV channel Al Jazeera, where he runs the popular program “Sharia and Life.” The intellectual Dr. Khaled Shawkat warns that Al Jazeera “has been hijacked” by the MB “to the extent that three or four Muslim Brotherhood members sometimes appear on a single news program.”

According to journalist Helle Merete Brix, Mohammed bin Rashid Al Maktoum, the ruler of Dubai, aided by Saudi Arabia, gives large amounts of petrodollar to various organizations at the forefront of the Islamization of Europe, such as the European Council for Fatwa and Research headed by Yusuf al-Qaradawi.

Israeli professor Raphael Israeli in his book *The Islamic Challenge in Europe* describes how Saudi Arabia sponsors many Islamic organizations, the OIC, the Muslim World League, the World Assembly of Muslim Youth etc. in addition to building mosques around the world:

“The Kingdom of Saudi Arabia has supported and contributed to the establishment of many mosques and Islamic centers amongst which the Cultural Center in Brussels, Belgium, which has received a total support of SR 19 million; the Islamic Center in Geneva, Switzerland, which receives an annual support of SR 19 million, and contains a large mosque, a cultural center, a school and a lecture hall; the Islamic Center in Madrid, Spain, which has had a total support of SR 27 million, and is one of the largest in Europe. It comprises a very large mosque, a prayer hall for women, a library, a lecture hall and a medical clinic; the Islamic Center in London, England to which the Kingdom has contributed some SR 25 million; the Islamic Center in Edinburgh, Scotland, which is located in the city center, and contains a mosque, which can accommodate 1,000 worshippers, and includes a library, a lecture hall and classrooms. It costs around SR 15 million. The Islamic Center in Rome, Italy that comprises a mosque, a library and a lecture hall. King Fahd donated US\$ 50 million (some 70% of the total) to cover the cost of construction.”

Former CIA director R. James Woolsey estimates that the Saudis have spent nearly \$90 billion since the mid-1970s to export their ideology into Muslim and non-Muslim countries alike. That may well be a conservative estimate. Since the spike in oil prices following the embargo/financial Jihad in 1973, Arab and Muslim states have received trillions of dollars from the sale of oil and gas, probably the greatest transfer of wealth in human history. A significant portion of this money has been used to buy an army of hirelings and apologists in non-Muslim countries, as well as on financing the global Jihad.

Prince Al-Waleed bin Talal bin Abdul Aziz Al-Saud, a member of the Saudi Royal Family, is an international investor ranked among the ten richest persons in the world. In 2005, Bin Talal bought 5.46% of voting shares in News Corp, the parent of Fox News. In December 2005 he boasted about his ability to change what viewers see. Covering the Jihad riots in France that fall, Fox ran a banner saying: “Muslim riots.” According to Talal, “I picked up the phone and called Murdoch... (and told him) these are not Muslim riots, these are riots out of poverty. Within 30 minutes, the title was changed from Muslim riots to civil riots.”

Harvard University and Georgetown University have received \$20 million donations from Prince bin Talal to finance Islamic studies. Martin Kramer, the author of *Ivory Towers on Sand: The Failure of Middle Eastern Studies in America*, said: “Prince Alwaleed knows that if you want to have an impact, places like Harvard or Georgetown, which is inside the Beltway, will make a difference.”

Georgetown said it would use the gift to expand its Center for Muslim-Christian Understanding. The leaders of the Center, renamed to Alwaleed bin Talal Center for Muslim-Christian Understanding, say it now will be used to put on workshops regarding Islam, addressing U.S. policy towards the Muslim world, addressing Muslim citizenship and civil liberties, and developing exchange programs for students from the Muslim world.

Georgetown professor John Esposito, founding director of the Center for Muslim-Christian Understanding, has, probably more than any other academic, contributed to downplaying the global Jihadist threat. Kramer states that during the 1970s, Esposito had prepared his thesis under his Muslim mentor Ismail R. Faruqi, a Palestinian theorist of the “Islamization of knowledge.” During the first part of his career, Esposito never studied or taught at a major Middle East center. In the 80s, he published a series of favorable books on Islam. In 1993, Esposito arrived at Georgetown, and has later claimed the status of “authority” in the field.

Journalist Stanley Kurtz has demonstrated how the Saudis have infiltrated the US education system and

influence what American school children are taught about Islam and the Middle East, not just at the university level but also at lower levels. The USA is not unique in this.

Robert Leiken and Steven Brooke published an article in *Foreign Affairs* about the “moderate” Muslim Brotherhood, arguing that the group has “rejected global Jihad” and “embraces democracy.” Several US Democratic members of Congress met with the head of the Brotherhood’s parliamentary bloc at the home of the U.S. ambassador to Egypt, despite that fact that the Egyptian MB has spawned several terrorist movements.

In a memo, the US State Department told its embassy in Cairo to launch a dialogue with religious groups because clashes with them would incite more attacks against US interests. They advised Washington to pressure the Egyptian government into allowing the MB to play a larger role in Egypt’s political landscape. There are signs that American authorities are reaching out to the Brotherhood. Steven Stalinsky, the executive director of the Middle East Media Research Institute, warns that “A lack of knowledge about the Muslim Brotherhood is evident on the part of U.S. officials who are now cozing up to the organization.”

As Youssef Ibrahim commented in the *New York Sun*: “For years, the Soviet Union benefited from those Vladimir Lenin is said to have dubbed ‘the useful idiots of the West’ — reporters, scholars, leftists, and assorted romantics who said the Soviet system of totalitarianism was not so bad.” He argues that the Brotherhood is now taking over this role. Ibrahim is tired of the silence from the Muslim majority: “In Islam, ‘silence is a sign of acceptance,’ as the Arabic Koranic saying goes...The question that hangs in the air so spectacularly now — particularly as England has been confronted once again by British Muslims plotting to kill hundreds — is this: What exactly are the Europeans waiting for before they round up all those Muslim warriors and their families and send them back to where they came from?”

The current leader of the MB, Mohammad Mahdi Akef, called on its members to serve its global agenda, declaring “I have complete faith that Islam will invade Europe and America.” On its English website, the Brotherhood professes moderation and praises Multiculturalism as a way to spread Islam. However, on their Arabic website, Akef in February 2007 reassured his followers that “the Jihad will lead to smashing Western civilization and replacing it with Islam which will dominate the world.” In the event that Muslims cannot achieve this goal in the near future, “Muslims are obliged to continue the Jihad that will cause the collapse of Western civilization and the ascendance of the Muslim civilization on its ruins.”

Hassan al-Banna founded the Muslim Brotherhood in 1928 with the vision of restoring the Islamic Caliphate. There are signs that his disciple Yusuf al-Qaradawi hasn’t given up this goal. In an interview with German weekly magazine *Der Spiegel*, Qaradawi said: “Islam is a single nation, there is only one Islamic law and we all pray to a single God. Eventually such a nation will also become political reality. But whether that will be a federation of already existing states, a monarchy or an Islamic republic remains to be seen.”

In one essay, al-Qaradawi writes that: “Secularism may be accepted in a Christian society but it can never enjoy a general acceptance in an Islamic society. Christianity is devoid of a shari’ah or a comprehensive system of life to which its adherents should be committed.” However, “as Islam is a comprehensive system of worship (‘ibadah) and legislation (Shari’ah), the acceptance of secularism means abandonment of Shari’ah,” and “the call for secularism among Muslims is atheism and a rejection of Islam. Its acceptance as a basis for rule in place of Shari’ah is downright riddah [apostasy].”

The adoption of secular laws and equality for Muslims and non-Muslims amounts to apostasy. Harsh words from a man who has voiced support for the traditional sharia death penalty for those leaving Islam.

According to the major website Islam Online, which is owned by Yusuf al-Qaradawi and sponsored by rich Arabs, “Islam is not a religion in the common, distorted meaning of the word, confining its scope only to the private life of man. By saying that it is a complete way of life, we mean that it caters for all the fields of human existence. In fact, Islam provides guidance for all walks of life — individual and social, material and moral, economic and political, legal and cultural, national and international.”

Famed historian Bernard Lewis in 2007 told the *Jerusalem Post* that Islam could soon be the dominant force in Europe. He warned that this Islamization could be assisted by “immigration and democracy.” It is a well-established fact that Muslims vote overwhelmingly for left-wing parties all over Europe.

Walid al-Kubaisi, a Norwegian of Iraqi origins and a critic of sharia supporters, believes Yusuf al-Qaradawi is more dangerous than terrorist leader Osama bin Laden: "In Europe, the Muslim Brotherhood discovered a unique opportunity: Democracy. The democratic system leaves room for freedom of religion and freedom of speech, and finances religious communities and religious organizations. This has been utilized by the Muslim Brotherhood to infiltrate the Muslim communities, recruit members and build the Islamist networks that have become so visible lately." Whereas bin Laden uses bombs, al-Qaradawi exploits democracy as a Trojan horse. The Brotherhood gets their activities financed from Germany, Britain etc. They gain recognition and infiltrate the democratic system.

According to Walid al-Kubaisi, the journalist Dr. Osama Fawzi has revealed that many of al-Qaradawi's trips to Western countries are for the purpose of receiving medical aid and treatment for impotence because he is married to a girl 60 years younger than himself. Kubaisi, who writes Arabic fluently, sent an email to Qaradawi's website, asking whether it was legal according to Islamic law to marry a nine-year-old girl. He got a "yes" in reply.

Muhammad himself, according to Islamic sources, married his wife Aisha when she was six years old and consummated the marriage when she was eight or nine. Since he is the perfect example to emulate for Muslims for time eternity, this is still legal in Islamic law today:

Sahih Bukhari Volume 7, Book 62, Number 64

*Narrated 'Aisha: that the Prophet married her when she was six years old and he consummated his marriage when she was nine years old, and then she remained with him for nine years (i.e., till his death).*

Yusuf al-Qaradawi has been hailed as a "moderate Muslim" by people such as London's Mayor Ken Livingstone, who represents the British Labour Party. Many Muslims voted for the Labour Party in previous elections, and London has a large and growing Muslim population. The cleric visited the UK in 2004, where he was welcomed by Livingstone, and chaired the annual meeting of the European Council of Fatwa and Research at London's City Hall. In January 2008, prominent Muslims pledged to back Ken Livingstone as Mayor of London during the elections in May 2008. A statement praised Livingstone for his support of a Multicultural society and for protecting Muslim communities against Islamophobia, and said that "We pledge to continue our support for the mayor on all levels possible in order to secure his staying in office for a third term." Among the 63 signatories was Tariq Ramadan.

In February 2008, al-Qaradawi was refused a visa to enter to the UK following pressure from British Conservatives. The Muslim Council of Britain (MCB) said that it deplored the decision, while the British Muslim Initiative (BMI) described the decision to bar al-Qaradawi as "an unwarranted insult to British Muslims." Yusuf al-Qaradawi has called for the death penalty for homosexuality, for the destruction of the state of Israel, has defended suicide attacks and preaches that husbands should beat disobedient wives.

*Note:* Boris Johnson from the Conservatives became the new Mayor of London following the 2008 elections.



## The Organization of the Islamic Conference and Eurabia

*This essay was first published at the website Jihad Watch in July 2008. It is republished here with a few changes.*

Dr. Andrew Bostom, editor of the excellent book The Legacy of Jihad and the recent book about Islamic anti-Semitism, warns that the 57 Muslim nations of the Organization of the Islamic Conference are trying to impose Islamic blasphemy law — which includes the death penalty for those who “blaspheme” the Muslim prophet Muhammad — as the universal standard across the world.

These sentiments of the OIC were reiterated more brazenly by Sheikh Yusuf al-Qaradawi, the spiritual leader of the Muslim Brotherhood. During a sermon in response to the Danish Muhammad cartoons which aired February 3, 2006, Qaradawi *demand*ed action from the United Nations in accordance with sharia-based conceptions of blasphemy: “...the governments [of the world] must be pressured to demand that the U.N. adopt a clear resolution or law that categorically prohibits affronts to prophets—to the prophets of the Lord and his Messengers, to His holy books, and to the religious holy places.”

As German journalist Henryk Broder noted back then: “Objectively speaking, the cartoon controversy was a tempest in a teacup. But subjectively it was a show of strength and, in the context of the ‘clash of civilizations,’ a dress rehearsal for the real thing. The Muslims demonstrated how quickly and effectively they can mobilize the masses, and the free West showed that it has nothing to counter the offensive — nothing but fear, cowardice and an overriding concern about the balance of trade. Now the Islamists know that they are dealing with a paper tiger whose roar is nothing but a tape recording.”

In the aftermath of the Cartoon Jihad, in Norway in June 2007 members of dozens of newspapers, TV stations and organizations participated in an international conference on how to “report diversity” in a non-offensive manner, with Arab News from Saudi Arabia as a moderator. Keynote speaker at the conference, Dr. Doudou Diène, the United Nations Special Envoy for racism, xenophobia and intolerance, urged the media to actively participate in the creation of a Multicultural society, and expressed concerns that the democratic process could lead to immigration-restrictive parties gaining influence in Western nations.

Diène said that it is a dangerous development when increasing numbers of intellectuals in the West believe that some cultures are better than others, and stated that “The media must transform diversity, which is a fact of life, into pluralism, which is a set of values.” Getting diversity accepted is the role of the education system, and acceptance is the role of the law. “Promoting and defending diversity is the task of the media.” Societies must recognize, accept and promote diversity, which always seems to mean sharia. Mr. Diène represents Senegal, an African Muslim country which is a member of the Organization of the Islamic Conference (OIC), the largest voting bloc at the United Nations, sponsored by Arab oil money.

There were already signs that large portions of the mainstream media have been working according to similar ideas long before his conference. In Britain, leading figures of the BBC have proudly announced that they actively promote Multiculturalism. In Denmark in 2008, while their country was threatened by Muslims across the world, public broadcaster Danmarks Radio, the local equivalent of the BBC and with the same left-wing bias, decided to hold a “Miss Headscarf” beauty contest for women with the only requirement being that they are over 15 and wear a headscarf or veil, the way proper Muslim women are supposed to do.

In March 2008, the United Nation’s Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon condemned Dutch MP Wilder’s movie *Fitna* as “offensively anti-Islamic,” and said that “There is no justification for hate speech or incitement to violence.” Does that mean that the UN is now going to ban the Koran? Earlier in March, the U.N. Human Rights Council, which is dominated by Muslim countries, passed a resolution saying it is deeply concerned about the defamation of religions and urging governments to prohibit it. The only religion specified was Islam. The document was put forward by the Organization of the Islamic Conference.

I have been saying for a long time that trying to export “democracy” to Islamic countries is pointless. Islam can be compatible with “democracy” in the limited sense of voting rights and majority rule, but this has never automatically implied individual liberty. (See my online booklet Is Islam Compatible With Democracy?)



It's a sick joke that American soldiers are bleeding literally and American taxpayers financially to export "democracy" to Iraq while Muslims are exporting sharia to us. Freedom is free speech, that's the simplest definition of it. Muslims are using the UN to limit criticism of Islam globally, which basically means putting the entire world under Islamic rule.

My view of the United Nations is quite clear: It is at best irrelevant. *At best*. Increasingly, it is turning into an outright enemy, an enemy funded by us but used to attack us. I'm tired of sponsoring enemies, at home and abroad. I'm all for boycotting the UN and making it truly irrelevant by bleeding it dry for funds and ultimately withdrawing from it.

Muslims have lots of oil and lots of babies and lots of aggression, but that's all they have. Otherwise, they're a spectacular failure. We need them for very little. They need us for virtually everything. We should exploit that. We should separate ourselves from the Islamic world as much as possible. They will suffer far more from this than we will. We can start by boycotting the UN, which is now little more than a tool for global sharia, and the Arab Muslims of the West Bank and Gaza, who reinvented themselves as "Palestinians" and started whining at the UN after the Israelis kicked their collective behinds in 1967.

Former Malaysian Prime Minister Mahathir Mohamad called upon Muslims worldwide to boycott Dutch products, following the release of the Islam-critical movie *Fitna* by Dutch politician Geert Wilders. Personally, I'm all for boycotts of and by Muslims. The more, the merrier. Mr. Mahathir held the notorious speech at the OIC conference in 2003 where he said that the Jews rule the world by proxy and that Muslims must unite to achieve a final victory over them. Not everybody remembers that he also boasted about the age when "Europeans had to kneel at the feet of Muslim scholars in order to access their own scholastic heritage."

Somebody should remind him that the so-called "golden age" of Islam was a result of a still-large non-Muslim population. As soon as that declined, due to harassment and discrimination, the Islamic world never recovered. Malaysia is sometimes portrayed as an economically successful Muslim nation, but that is because it only recently became majority Muslim and still has a large Chinese, Indian and other non-Muslim minority. Since Islam is becoming more aggressive and Muslims increase discrimination of non-Muslims, infidels will leave, and Malaysia will gradually be reduced to just another failed sharia state.

In 2008, the current Malaysian Prime Minister Abdullah Badawi warned his British counterpart, PM Brown, that Muslim extremism in Britain will grow unless the government and society learn to understand Islam and allow the country's Muslims to live under sharia law. What he didn't say is that sharia applies to all members of society, also non-Muslims, who should have their freedoms curtailed as well.

Historian David Littman is a representative to the United Nations of the Association for World Education. He has spent years tracking the rise of Islamic influence at the UN. According to him, "In recent years, representatives of some Muslim states have demanded, and often received, special treatment at the United Nations." As a result, "non-diplomatic terms such as 'blasphemy' and 'defamation of Islam' have seeped into the United Nations system, leading to a situation in which non-Muslim governments accept certain rules of conduct in conformity with Islamic law (the Shari'a) and acquiesce to a self-imposed silence regarding topics touching on Islam."

In May 2007, the foreign ministers of the Organization of the Islamic Conference (OIC) expressed "grave concern" at the rising tide of intolerance against Muslims, especially in Europe and North America. They described "Islamophobia" as a deliberate defamation of Islam, and pointed out that whenever the issue of Islamophobia was discussed in international forums, the Western bloc, particularly some members of the European Union, tried to avoid discussing the core issue and instead diverted the attention from their region to the situation of non-Muslims and human rights in the OIC member states.

In June 2008, the OIC announced its plan for fighting Islamophobia. Here's what Ekmeleddin Ihsanoglu, their Secretary General, had to say: "We are encouraged to see however, that an awareness of the dangers of Islamophobia is gradually setting in the West. The condemnation by many Western leaders and governments of Islamophobic acts such as the [Dutch movie] *Fitna* are positive confidence building measures that lead us to believe that all is not lost and that the gap can be closed in time. But mere condemnation or distancing from the acts of the perpetrators of Islamophobia will not resolve the issue as long as they remain free to carry on with their campaign of incitement and provocation on the plea of freedom of expression."

Obviously, the intention of the OIC is to do everything within its power to make sure that the citizens of the Western democracies do not remain free. Mr. Ihsanoglu unveiled a ten-point program that he proposed in order to meet the OIC's ambitious goals. The plan is all there, laid out in black and white for anyone to read. Unfortunately, not everybody understands its implications.

In *Der Spiegel* in June 2008, Dirk Kurbjuweit commented on the Irish popular rejection of the Lisbon Treaty/EU Constitution by concluding that "Europe's politicians are determined to avoid asking the people their opinion. And they are right to do so." According to him, "Again and again, they trick their populations into accepting the European Union. It's been going on for 50 years: politicians making policy against the people. The only time anyone ever notices is when the people — one people, in this case — are asked for their opinion. It happened in Ireland recently, when the Irish made it clear that they refuse to accept the politics of scoundrels."

Regarding German chancellor Angela Merkel, he speculates whether "she is in fact wholeheartedly behind a strengthening of the European Union, perhaps even knowingly against the wishes of German citizens." Dirk Kurbjuweit seems to approve of this strategy of denying citizens a say in the future of their countries and their children. He concludes:

"Perhaps the EU's secret strategy is called 'strategic boredom' — attract no attention and make no waves, but continue to plod along, quietly and stubbornly, ignoring the murmurs of concern from all around. The scoundrels in Brussels have sold the European people a lot of things: a single market, the euro, the lifting of many border controls and, most recently, a binding global climate policy. These have all been good things, and they have helped make Europe an eminently livable continent. Despite the many dull moments and emotions that have been negative at best, the end result has been laudable. Most of these improvements would have been held up, if not outright prevented, by referendums. Democracy doesn't mean having unlimited confidence in citizens. Sometimes the big picture is in better hands when politicians are running it, and a big picture takes time."

The "big picture" which is being implemented by these same political elites does not only include political integration within Europe, it also includes European cultural, political and economic integration with the Arab-Islamic world, conducted largely without the approval of European citizens. Mr. Kurbjuweit didn't mention that part.

In March 2008, Terry Davis, a former politician for the British Labour Party and now the General Secretary of the Council of Europe, wrote a letter in Danish newspaper *Jyllands-Posten* denouncing the republishing of the Muhammad cartoons, stating that "freedom of speech should not be used as a freedom to insult." As *Jyllands-Posten* wrote in a response, "Freedom of expression is exactly the freedom to insult anyone within the framework of the law."

The Council of Europe (CoE) was founded in 1949, earlier than the European Community/European Union. It is still a separate organization but very much within the orbit of the EU's Eurabian networks and cooperates increasingly closer on "dialogue" with Islamic countries. For instance, the North-South Centre (for cooperation between Europe and the Arab world), officially named the European Centre for Global Interdependence and Solidarity, is an EU/CoE partnership. A Memorandum of Understanding between the Council of Europe and the European Union from May 2007 outlines many areas of cooperation between the two organizations, including intercultural dialogue and cultural diversity, education and youth as well as the fight against discrimination, racism, xenophobia and intolerance (which includes "Islamophobia").

For instance, *Resolution 1605 of the Council of Europe — European Muslim communities confronted with extremism from 2008* states the following:

Council of Europe member states should continue to be vigilant in their work to prevent and combat the phenomenon of Islamophobia.

9. In light of the above, the Assembly calls on the member states of the Council of Europe to:
- 9.2. condemn and combat Islamophobia;

- 9.7.8. removing unnecessary legal or administrative obstacles to the construction of a sufficient number of appropriate places of worship for the practice of Islam;
- 9.7.9. ensuring that school textbooks do not portray Islam as a hostile or threatening religion;
- 11.6. encourage young European Muslims to become imams;
- 11.8. encourage the promotion of fair coverage of Muslim reality and views in the media and ensure that the voice of moderate Muslims is also reported;
- 11.9. develop ethical guidelines to combat Islamophobia in the media and in favour of cultural tolerance and understanding, in co-operation with appropriate media organisations

One of the websites linked to from the CoE's homepage is the organization "[All different, all equal](#)." Yes, it does sound like something out of George Orwell's classic novel *Animal Farm*, where all animals are equal, but some animals are more equal than others. The organization champions many [activities](#). One of them was when the Council of Europe's Directorate of Youth and Sport and the Directorate of External Relations and Co-operation of the Islamic Organisation for Education, Science and Culture (ISESCO) in 2007 organized an "intercultural course" on Arabic language and culture in Morocco, intended for members of European youth organizations between the ages of 18 and 30. It was intended to "develop their language skills, to promote intercultural and interreligious dialogue, international understanding, and to combat prejudice and all forms of racism and xenophobia."

There are also networks Combating Social Exclusion and Discrimination, and several youth organizations linked to by "All different, all equal" participated in a "Rainbow Paper" with recommendations for making [Intercultural Dialogue](#) happen on the ground. 2008 is the official "European Year of Intercultural Dialogue," jointly coordinated by the Council of Europe and the European Union. This "dialogue" is an extension of the EU's long-term plans for Euro-Arab dialogue, and focuses mainly on Islam and why Europeans should learn to love Islamic culture.

In connection with this, the Council of Europe in 2008 published a White Paper ([pdf](#)) on Intercultural Dialogue entitled "Living Together As Equals in Dignity." It places particular emphasis on providing proper "Multicultural" education to European children: "Within the formal curriculum, the intercultural dimension straddles all subjects. History, language education and the teaching of religious and convictional facts are perhaps among the most relevant." Concerted efforts should be made to "avoid prejudice," and "In 2007, the European Ministers of Education underlined the importance of measures to improve understanding between cultural and/or religious communities through school education."

The White Paper focuses on the young: "Youth and sport organisations, together with religious communities, are particularly well placed to advance intercultural dialogue in a non-formal education context...Educators at all levels play an essential role in fostering intercultural dialogue and in preparing future generations for dialogue...Kindergartens, schools, youth clubs and youth activities in general are key sites for intercultural learning and dialogue." Moreover, "The workplace should not be ignored as a site for intercultural dialogue."

Among recommendations, the paper says the following:

"Public debate has to be marked by respect for cultural diversity. Public displays of racism, xenophobia or any other form of intolerance must be rejected and condemned, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the European Convention on Human Rights, irrespective of whether they originate with bearers of public office or in civil society. Every form of stigmatisation of persons belonging to minority and disadvantaged groups in public discourse needs to be ruled out. The media can make a positive contribution to the fight against intolerance, especially where they foster a culture of understanding between members of different ethnic, cultural, linguistic and religious communities. Media professionals should reflect on the problem of intolerance in the increasingly multicultural and multi-ethnic environment of the member states and on the measures which they might take to promote tolerance, mutual understanding and respect. States should have robust legislation to outlaw 'hate speech' and racist, xenophobic, homophobic, antisemitic, islamophobic and

antigypsy or other expressions, where this incites hatred or violence. Members of the criminal justice system should be well trained to implement and uphold such legislation. Independent national anti-discrimination bodies or similar structures should also be in place, to scrutinise the effectiveness of such legislation.”

“Islamophobia” is repeatedly singled out as one of the forms of “discrimination and racism” that needs to be ruthlessly stamped out through indoctrination as well as legal means across the entire European continent, a policy which is being implemented at an accelerating pace.

In addition to forcing the education system to teach European children to love “Islamic culture,” the media should do the same with the adults: “The Council of Europe, together with media professionals and journalism training institutions, is launching in 2008 a campaign against discrimination, bringing into focus the role of the media in a multicultural Europe. Journalism, promoted in a responsible manner through codes of ethics as advanced by the media industry itself and a culture-sensitive training of journalists, can help provide fora for intercultural dialogue.”

Finally, the White Paper lists many institutions it should cooperate with, most of them Islamic organizations or organizations geared towards appeasing Muslims, for instance the Anna Lindh Euro-Mediterranean Foundation for the Dialogue between Cultures, which is one of the EU’s most important instruments for Eurabian cooperation:

“The Council of Europe will promote and expand co-operation with other organisations active in intercultural dialogue, including UNESCO and the ‘Alliance of Civilizations’ initiative, the OSCE, the EU and the Anna Lindh Euro-Mediterranean Foundation for the Dialogue between Cultures, as well as other regional organisations, such as the League of Arab States and its educational, cultural and scientific organisation, ALECSO, representing a region with many ties to Europe and a distinct cultural tradition. The Council of Europe will also promote intercultural dialogue on the basis of its standards and values when cooperating in the context of specific projects with institutions such as the Islamic Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (ISESCO) and the Research Center for Islamic History, Art and Culture (IRCICA). The regional focus of this co-operation will be the interaction between Europe and its neighbouring regions, specifically the southern shores of the Mediterranean, the Middle East and Central Asia.”

Notice the cooperation with institutions dedicated to “Islamic history.” Concerted efforts are underway to rewrite European school textbooks in order to promote Islam in a positive light. In the European Parliament, the German Christian Democrat Hans-Gert Pöttering has stated that textbooks should be reviewed for intolerant depictions of Islam to ensure they don’t propagate prejudice. He suggested that the EU could co-operate with the Organization of the Islamic Conference to create a textbook review committee. This is in line with the general policy of the Organization of the Islamic Conference (OIC), which wants to rewrite school textbooks around the world to remove anything critical of Islam, silence mentioning of the victims of 1400 years of Islamic Jihad and glorify the achievements of “Islamic civilization.”

The CoE and the EU implement policies aimed to provide our children with a positive and non-threatening view of Islam, thus indoctrinating them to accept Islamization. They are doing this behind our backs, without consulting us, and they can do so because the EU is constructed as a top-down organization where all crucial decisions are taken behind closed doors and imposed on the general public by an unelected oligarchy, who may or may not be bought and paid for by our enemies. This is a betrayal, but we should remember that they can do this because we gave them the tools to do so, or at least didn’t object strongly enough when they took these tools, maybe because we didn’t understand the full significance of them, or because we were lazy, or both. The only way to stop this is to take away these tools from the hostile Eurabian oligarchy, which requires dissolving both the EU and the CoE.

In June 2008, the OIC stated that “We sent a clear message to the West regarding the red lines that should not be crossed.” As Robert Spencer commented, “That sounds like the statement of a victor in a war, dictating terms to the vanquished.” Muslims are happy with their “progress” in Europe and now concentrate their fire



on North America:

“We have established an OIC Group in Washington D.C.,’ Ihsanoglu explained, ‘with the aim of playing a more active role in engaging American policy makers.’ This will involve agitating for laws restricting free speech: ‘And in confronting the Danish cartoons and the Dutch film ‘Fitna,’ (which showed Muslims acting on violent passages in the Qur’an), Ihsanoglu continued, ‘we sent a clear message to the West regarding the red lines that should not be crossed.’ Ihsanoglu says it’s already working: ‘As we speak, the official West and its public opinion are all now well-aware of the sensitivities of these issues. They have also started to look seriously into the question of freedom of expression from the perspective of its inherent responsibility, which should not be overlooked.’ In other words, ‘irresponsible’ speech — which is defined as speech he disagrees with — should be banned.”

In the USA, the New York Times has suggested that the US should become more like Europe and Canada, abandon the silly protections of free speech enshrined in the First Amendment and ban “racism and hate speech.” “It is not clear to me that the Europeans are mistaken,” Jeremy Waldron, a legal philosopher, wrote in The New York Review of Books, “when they say that a liberal democracy must take affirmative responsibility for protecting the atmosphere of mutual respect against certain forms of vicious attack.”

The only “vicious attacks” today are those by Muslims against the free speech and liberty of non-Muslims around the world. The attacks by both individual Muslims and international organizations such as the OIC on criticism of Islam are part of a campaign to force the entire planet’s population to accept sharia censorship and thus de facto Islamic rule, a scenario which will permanently end human freedom in any meaningful sense of the word. There can be no compromise with such an agenda. I do not always agree with American policies vis-à-vis Islam, and the US is far from free of Political Correctness and informal censorship, but when it comes to legal protection of free speech, the American approach is correct, and the European — and Canadian — one is dead wrong. We do not need more ideological censorship. On the contrary, we need to protect and expand the First Amendment of the Bill of Rights.

Meanwhile, Europe’s southern flank is being overrun by illegal immigration, much of it from Muslim countries. Greece received 112,000 illegal immigrants in 2007 and the number is expected to rise in 2008. Many of those immigrants come overseas from Turkey. Turkey is a conduit for illegal immigrants from central Asia and Africa because its shores lie just a few kilometres across from the islands of Samos, Mytilene and Kos, some of the easternmost points of EU territory. According to the *International Herald Tribune*, in 2008 the historic center of Athens has been riven by street battles involving what the police characterize as rival groups, often involved in dealing drugs, from Afghanistan, Iraq and war-torn African countries wielding swords, axes and machetes. Store owners and residents are leaving the busy central shopping and restaurant district. According to a residents’ group, dozens of people renting in the area have left their homes in the past year, and several stores have closed, chiefly small but long-established neighborhood conveniences like bakeries, hardware stores or delicatessens. “The city center has been taken hostage by gangs of illegal immigrants with knives.”

Thomas Hammarberg, human rights commissioner at the Council of Europe, has criticized Greece and other EU states for “criminalizing the irregular entry and presence of migrants as part of a policy of so-called migration management. Political decision-makers should not lose the human rights perspective in migration,” Hammarberg wrote. “Migrants coming from war-torn states should be given refuge.”

To the Council of Europe, those coming from failed nations have a “right” to settle in the West. As we have seen above, the CoE also combats “Islamophobia and racism.” Another way of saying this is that “human rights” mean that everybody has the right to settle in our cities; we do not have the right to object to this. Where should our children go when the newly arrived and their failed cultures have destroyed our countries as well? The CoE doesn’t say. This is especially sensitive in Greece, a country which was for centuries under Turkish Muslim rule. Muslims have spent the better part of a thousand years destroying communities of Greek-speaking Christians in the eastern Mediterranean. Now Greeks and other Europeans are forced to import large numbers of Muslims, in the name of “human rights.”



## Ten Reasons to Get Rid of the European Union

*This text was published at the Gates of Vienna blog in early October 2008. It is published here with some later additions.*

### The EU Promotes Crime and Instability

The EU does not protect the peace in Europe. On the contrary, it undermines stability in the continent by dismantling border controls at a time of the greatest population movements in human history, with many migrants coming from politically unstable countries whose instability spills over to European states. Through its senseless immigration policies, the EU could become partly responsible for triggering civil wars in several European countries. Maybe it will be remembered as the “peace project” which brought war to Europe, again.

The European Union has created a borderless region from Greece to France and from Portugal to Finland, yet the citizens of these countries still pay most of their taxes to nation states whose borders are no longer upheld. It is ridiculous to pay up to half of your income to an entity that no longer controls its own territory or legislation. Unless national borders are re-established, the citizens of EU member states no longer have any obligation to pay taxes at all.

The EU promotes a ridiculous amount of laws and regulations, yet street crime largely goes unpunished. Laws are used to punish the law-abiding while real criminals rule the streets, although this flaw is admittedly shared with many national governments. European authorities make a mockery out of the social contract every single day as they fail to uphold law and order. Unless the relevant authorities improve their efforts against crime drastically, we can expect to see normal European citizens acquire arms for their own protection in rapidly increasing numbers. One can’t blame them, for in several countries, like the UK, Sweden or the Netherlands, the authorities are more concerned with enforcing speech codes and Political Correctness than with dealing with criminals in a forceful way. We need confidence in our police force or we will have to find other means to protect our lives and property.

The EU does not give Europeans a “voice” on the international arena. It’s a bureaucratic monster at best, a dangerous Utopian project at worst. It makes our enemies take us less seriously, not more. It is not about giving anybody a voice; it is about silencing the voices we already have, by depriving us of any say regarding our future and the destinies of our peoples.

Joschka Fischer, ex-German foreign minister, warns that Europe risks becoming a “playground” for upcoming superpowers in the 21st century. He wants more EU cooperation to remedy this. But we already are a playground for foreign nations, for Muslim ones in particular, who can dump their unsustainable population growth in our countries. This is actively encouraged by the EU. It is going to be interesting for future historians to unveil how many European leaders and officials have been bought and paid for by Saudi oil money.

The idea that the EU is going to become a superpower is laughable. Europe at the dawn of the 21st century is a global joke, a decadent and weak continent, despised by its enemies and viewed with pity by its friends. Outsiders don’t expect Europe to generate anything new, quite a few will be surprised if it even survives. This image will not be improved by leaders who attack their own people, sell out their historical legacy to their worst enemies and muzzle those who object to this. It is ridiculous to believe that this ramshackle, top-heavy Frankenstein monster is going to make Europe more competitive.

### The EU Weakens Europe’s Cultural Defenses

The EU is systematically surrendering the continent to our worst enemies. When French, Dutch and Irish voters rejected the EU Constitution, the EU elites moved on as if nothing had happened. When the Islamic world says that the EU should work to eradicate “Islamophobia,” they immediately consent to do this. When an organization ignores the interests of its own people yet implements the interests of that people’s enemies, that organization has become an actively hostile entity run by a corrupt class of abject traitors. This is what the EU is today.

Those inhabiting the European continent are first and foremost Germans, Poles, Italians, Hungarians, Portuguese etc. “Europe” has existed mainly to protect the continent against Islamic expansionism. Charles Martel created Europe in the modern sense when he defeated the Arab invasion in the seventh century, aided by people such as Pelayo, who started the Reconquista in the Iberian Peninsula, John Hunyadi and Lazar of Serbia who fought against the Turks in the Balkans and John III Sobieski, King of Poland, who beat the Ottomans during the 1683 Battle of Vienna. The EU is actively working to undo everything Charles Martel and these men achieved. This makes it the *anti-European Union*.

-----

Immigrants are a “protected class” for Multiculturalists, who need them as a battering ram to destroy existing identities and forge a new “pan-European” identity (and eventually a “global identity,” I suspect). I found this quote in the magazine [Signandsight.com](http://Signandsight.com) from June 2008. Journalist Arno Widmann witnessed a meeting between Tariq Ramadan, the grandson of the founder of the Muslim Brotherhood, and theorist Jürgen Habermas. Widmann was extremely impressed by Ramadan: “The Irish are first and foremost Irish, the Danish are Danish, the Germans Germans and the Belgians are primarily Flemish or Walloon. Immigrants who are prevented from becoming Irish, Danes and Germans but who are called upon to be more European than Europeans ever were, have no option other than to become Europeans. They will be the first true Europeans. **No Europe without Muslims** [emphasis in the original].”

The EU is deliberately destroying the cultural traditions of member states by flooding them with immigrants and eradicating native traditions. This is a gross violation of the rights of the indigenous peoples across an entire continent. Europe has some of the richest cultural traditions on the planet. To replace this with sharia barbarism is a crime against humanity. The European Union is currently the principal (though not the only) motor behind the Islamization of Europe, perhaps the greatest betrayal in this civilization’s history. Appeasement of Islam and Muslims is so deeply immersed into the structural DNA of the EU that the only way to stop the Islamization of the continent is to get rid of the EU. All of it.

### **The EU Promotes a Bloated Bureaucracy**

A study released by the organization [Open Europe](http://OpenEurope.org) in August 2008 found that the EU employs an “army” of bureaucrats, and that the actual number of individuals required to run the EU is close to 170,000 — more than 7 times the 23,000 figure sometimes cited by the Commission.

According to them, “The legislative process of the EU is an extremely complex and opaque system, making it very difficult to identify how many people are actually involved in formulating, implementing and overseeing legislation. However, research by Open Europe, using limited available information, shows that just to draft and work out how to implement legislation the EU requires a bureaucratic staff of around 62,026 people. This figure reveals where the EU’s real legislative work is actually done: in committees, behind closed doors and out of the public eye. Most of the work takes place away from the core institutions within Expert Groups, Council Groups, and what are known as Comitology committees.”

Notice how this closed and secretive process of drafting legislation for half a billion people resembles that of a dictatorship. The EU follows a strategy of hide in plain sight and conceals the real power behind layers of bureaucratic complexities. This strategy was also followed with the drafting of the ridiculously long European Constitution.

If somebody presented you with a contract of hundreds of pages of more or less incomprehensible technical language which was to govern all aspects of your life and that of your children and grandchildren, and that person told you to just take his word for it that it is good and could you please sign on the dotted line, would you have accepted it? That is essentially what the EU has done regarding the fate of an entire continent, not just a single family. When some annoying people, such as the Dutch and the Irish, were unkind enough not to consent blindly to their new serfdom, the EU decided that they were bound by the contract they just rejected, anyway. It’s arrogance on a monumental scale, if not plain treason.

The EU is not yet a true, totalitarian entity, but it already holds most of the tools required in order to become one. It has managed to corrupt the national elites to sell out the freedom of their peoples by inviting them to take part in the world’s largest racket, paid for by European taxpayers. The growing pan-European nanny state now interferes with every aspect of social and economic life, governed by an unaccountable, arrogant and often hostile minority of social engineers who wish to impose their way of thinking on the majority.

## Excessive Regulation and Centralization is bad for Freedom and for Prosperity

Europe once became a dynamic continent thanks to competition at all levels. It is now virtually impossible to find a sector of society that is untouched by the often excessive EU regulations. The EU functions as a huge superstate centrally directed by statist obsessed by regulations. They have learnt little from history, where central planning has been an almost universal failure. Here is what Nathan Rosenberg and L.E. Birdzell Jr. say in *How The West Grew Rich: The Economic Transformation Of The Industrial World*:

“Initially, the West’s achievement of autonomy stemmed from a relaxation, or a weakening, of political and religious controls, giving other departments of social life the opportunity to experiment with change. Growth is, of course, a form of change, and growth is impossible when change is not permitted. Any *successful* change requires a large measure of freedom to experiment. A grant of that kind of freedom costs a society’s rulers their feeling of control, as if they were conceding to others the power to determine the society’s future. The great majority of societies, past and present, have not allowed it. Nor have they escaped from poverty.”

Moreover, “Western technology developed in the special context of a high degree of autonomy among the political, religious, scientific, and economic spheres of social life. Is this high degree of autonomy indispensable to the successful application of technology to economic welfare? Few Western scientists would disagree with the proposition that a high degree of autonomy of the scientific sphere from political or religious control is essential to scientific advance. It is almost as clear that a similar autonomy, in much the same degree, is essential to the economic process of translating scientific advances into goods and services. The technological capability of a society is bound to be degraded if control of either scientific inquiry or innovation is located at points of political or religious authority that combine an interest in controlling the outcome of technological development with the power to restrict or direct experiment. In all well-ordered societies, political authority is dedicated to stability, security, and the status quo. It is thus singularly ill-qualified to direct or channel activity intended to produce instability, insecurity, and change.”

The European Union cannot be anything but anti-liberty because it concentrates far too much power in a centralized bureaucratic system that is almost impossible for outsiders to understand. As the Austrian economist Friedrich Hayek warned in *The Road to Serfdom*:

“To imagine that the economic life of a vast area comprising many different people can be directed or planned by democratic procedure betrays a complete lack of awareness of the problems such planning would raise. Planning on an international scale, even more than is true on a national scale, cannot be anything but a naked rule of force, an imposition by a small group on all the rest of that sort of standard and employment which the planners think suitable for the rest.”

## The Lack of a Real Separation of Powers Invites Abuse of Power

The pompous former French President Valéry Giscard d’Estaing declared that the creation of the EU Constitution was Europe’s “Philadelphia moment,” alluding to the Philadelphia Convention or Constitutional Convention in the newly formed the United States of America in 1787. The USA has its flaws, but if Mr. Giscard d’Estaing had actually understood the American Constitution, he would have discovered that James Madison, Thomas Jefferson and others took great care to implement checks and balances in their new state. This is sorely lacking in the EU. The American constitution is relatively short and understandable whereas the EU Constitution is hundreds of pages long, largely incomprehensible and displays an almost sharia-like desire to regulate all aspects of human life.

Madison, Jefferson, George Washington and the American Founding Fathers acted in the open and were generally elected by their peers. Contrast this with Jean Monnet, who is credited with having laid the foundations of the EU despite the fact that most EU citizens today haven’t heard of him. He was never elected to any public office, but worked behind the scenes to implement a secret agenda. I read an interview with a senior Brussels lobbyist who dubbed Monnet “the most successful lobbyist in history.” To this day, the EU capital of Brussels is dominated by lobbyists. Washington D.C. has its fair share of lobbyists, too, and this can be problematic at times. You can make a good case for claiming that the American system is in trouble and no longer works as it was intended to in the early twenty-first century. Nevertheless, the difference is that the EU capital is dominated *only* by lobbyists and unelected bureaucrats, with very little real popular influence.

We should study the work of the great eighteenth century French thinker Montesquieu, who admired the British political system. He advocated that the executive, legislative and judicial branches of government should be assigned to different bodies, where each of them would not be powerful enough to impose its will on society. This is because “constant experience shows us that every man invested with power is apt to abuse it, and to carry his authority as far as it will go.” This separation of powers is almost totally absent in the European Union, where there is weak to non-existent separation between the legislative, the executive and the judicial branches, and where all of them function without the consent of the public. In short, a small number of people can draft and implement laws without consulting the people, and these take precedence over the laws passed by elected assemblies. This is a blueprint for a dictatorship.

In 2006, the European Commission (the EU’s government) announced that it would send its proposals for EU laws to national parliaments for comment — but it made clear that Brussels would only “take note” of national parliamentarians’ wishes. The European Union’s concept of “consultation” is that the people or their representatives should give their “advice,” and then the EU’s leaders should be free to ignore this advice.

In 2007, former German president Roman Herzog warned that parliamentary democracy was under threat from the EU. Between 1999 and 2004, 84 percent of the legal acts in Germany — and the majority in all EU member states — stemmed from Brussels. According to Herzog, “EU policies suffer to an alarming degree from a lack of democracy and a de facto suspension of the separation of powers.” Despite this, the EU was largely a non-issue during the 2005 German elections. One gets the feeling that the real issues of substance are not subject to public debate. National elections have become an increasingly empty ritual. The important issues have already been settled beforehand behind closed doors.

Free citizens should obey laws that are passed with the best long-term interests of their nation and people in mind. Most of the laws within the EU’s area are no longer passed by elected national representatives, but by unaccountable EU bureaucrats, some of whom could potentially have been bought and paid by our Islamic enemies with Arab oil money. As such, the citizens of these nations no longer have any obligation to obey these laws.

As Montesquieu warned, “When the legislative and executive powers are united in the same person, or in the same body of magistrates, there can be no liberty; because apprehensions may arise, lest the same monarch or senate should enact tyrannical laws, to execute them in a tyrannical manner.” He also stated that “Useless laws weaken the necessary laws.” The current problem with the EU is not just the content of laws and the way they are drafted and passed, but also their sheer volume. The 10 new members who joined the EU in 2004 were required to transpose into national law 26,000 items of legislation or 75,000 pages of text. Law-abiding citizens are turned into criminals by laws regulating speech and behavior, while real criminals rule the streets in our cities. This situation will either lead to a police state, to a total breakdown in law and order, or both.

### **The Lack of Transparency Leaves the EU Vulnerable to Hostile Infiltration**

There will no doubt be debates among future historians about how EU leaders could do something as stupid as the creation of the Eurabian networks. I suspect one of the answers will be: They did it because they could. I have heard some Socialists argue that the Communist system of the Soviet Union could have worked if it didn’t end up with a leader like Stalin. This view is fundamentally flawed, for the system itself invited a Stalin, or a Mao; there were no real restraints on the power of the rulers. As Lord Acton said, “Power tends to corrupt, and absolute power corrupts absolutely.” The same goes for the EU.

At least two conditions must be fulfilled in order to prevent the arbitrary use of power. The first is a system of formal and informal checks and balances, giving the possibility of peacefully removing officials who are not doing their job. The second is transparency, so people know what their representatives are doing. The EU deliberately ignores both these conditions. Vast quantities of power have been transferred to shady backrooms and structures the average citizen hardly knows exist. Eurabia was created through such channels. The reason why European leaders could commit a betrayal as large as this was not only because EU authorities are not formally subjected to the popular will, but because they have made the decision-making process incredibly complicated and moved real power out of the public view.



There is every reason to believe that some of those claiming to be our representatives have been bribed and/or blackmailed by Muslim countries and other enemies to implement agendas hostile to our interests. No system is perfect, but a non-transparent system such as the EU is particularly vulnerable to infiltration from outsiders and hostile foreign interests.

The “anti-discrimination laws” we now see in Western Europe are an indication that the democratic system no longer works as intended. These laws come from a small group of self-appointed leaders who respond to pressure from the Islamic world, not from their own people. The European political elites increasingly risk being seen as collaborators and puppets for our enemies because that’s in many cases how they act.

### **The EU Leads to Less Freedom of Speech**

The EU does nothing to promote freedom in Europe, but rather spends a great deal of time trying to stamp out what’s left of it. The EU, in cooperation with Islamic countries, is rewriting school textbooks across the European continent to present a more “positive” image of Islam. The EU increasingly views the media and the education system simply as a prolonged arm of the state. This is the hallmark of a totalitarian state, which is what the EUSSR is gradually becoming. One gets the feeling that the EU’s concept of a “united Europe” means one nation, one people — and one allowed opinion. It is tempting to say one allowed religion as well: Islam.

According to British writer [Daniel Hannan](#), “Eurocrats instinctively dislike spontaneous activity. To them, ‘unregulated’ is almost synonymous with ‘illegal’. The bureaucratic mindset demands uniformity, licensing, order. Eurocrats are especially upset because many bloggers, being of an anarchic disposition, are anti-Brussels. In the French, Dutch and Irish referendums, the MSM [mainstream media] were uniformly pro-treaty, whereas internet activity was overwhelmingly sceptical. Bruno Waterfield recently reported on a secret Commission report about the danger posed by online libertarians: ‘Apart from official websites, the internet has largely been a space left to anti-European feeling. Given the ability to reach an audience at a much lower cost, and given the simplicity of the No campaign messages, it has proven to be easily malleable during the campaign and pre-campaign period.’ The EU’s solution? Why, to regulate blogs!”

At the time of writing, it looks like the most radical proposals to regulate independent websites have been watered down, but there is no doubt that the EU will make new attempts to censor the Internet, especially since the organization has successfully bribed much of the traditional media. In 2007, the EU agreed to make incitement to racism and xenophobia a [crime across the 27-nation bloc](#). Under [the new law](#), offenders will face up to three years in jail for “public incitement to violence or hatred, directed against a group of persons or a member of such a group defined by reference to race, colour, religion, descent or national or ethnic origin.” The term “inciting hatred” against “religion” will no doubt be used to silence critics of Islam, of the EU’s pro-Islamic policies and of mass immigration in general.

Every single action the EU has taken vis-à-vis these subjects have led to more restrictions of free speech, online and offline. There is no reason not to expect that trend to continue, especially since the EU tries consistently to placate Muslims and other immigrant groups in every way possible. The EU’s attempts to crush dissent and silence criticism of its ideas will become increasingly aggressive and hard to ignore.

### **The EU Fails to Consult its Citizens and Insults Them When Doing So**

The Irish referendum in 2008 on the proposed EU Constitution/ Lisbon Treaty is a powerful testimony to the evil nature of the European Union. Before the referendum, a number of EU leaders made it perfectly clear that the Lisbon Treaty was virtually identical to the European Constitution which had been rejected by Dutch and French voters in 2005, and which should then presumably have been dead.

Former French President [Valéry Giscard d’Estaing](#) (the chief drafter of the Constitution) said: “the proposals in the original constitutional treaty are practically unchanged. They have simply been dispersed through old treaties in the form of amendments. Why this subtle change? Above all, to head off any threat of referenda by avoiding any form of constitutional vocabulary.” [D’Estaing also said](#): “Public opinion will be led to adopt, without knowing it, the proposals that we dare not present to them directly... All the earlier proposals will be in the new text, but will be hidden and disguised in some way.” Spanish PM [José Luis Rodríguez Zapatero](#) said: “We have not let a single substantial point of the Constitutional Treaty go...” Italian President [Giorgio Napolitano](#) said: “Those who are anti-EU are terrorists. It is psychological terrorism to suggest the specter of a



European superstate.”

Irish Prime Minister Brian Cowen admitted that he had not read the Lisbon Treaty in full, but nonetheless assured his people that it was good and that Irishmen should vote “yes” based on this assurance. He said that voters were being asked to give the EU a “more effective and efficient decision-making process.”

If a dictator decides to ignore the opinion of everybody else and implement policies as he sees fit without consulting anybody, this could be seen as a “more efficient” decision-making process from a certain point of view. Is it this kind of “efficiency” the EU is promoting? Mr. Cowen doesn’t say, but it’s tempting to speculate that the answer is “yes.” According to the words and actions of the EU elites, the will of the people is merely an annoying speed bump which slows down the implementation of their supremely enlightened policies.

After the referendum, when it was clear that the Irish would have none of this trick, the Irish EU Commissioner Charlie McCreevy revealed that he had not read the Lisbon Treaty himself: “I would predict that there won’t be 250 people in the whole of the 4.2 million population of Ireland that have read the treaties cover-to-cover. I further predict that there is not 10 percent of that 250 that will understand every section and subsection,” he said. “But is there anything different about that?” said the Commissioner, adding: “Does anyone read the finance act?” referring to the lengthy documents he drew up when he was finance minister in Ireland.

Let us repeat this again. This man stated — probably correctly — that not more than a couple of dozen people among millions of citizens actually understood the document they were supposed to vote over, yet he saw nothing inherently wrong with this. The EU Constitution/ Lisbon Treaty would finalize the transfer of authority to a new pan-European superstate with almost unlimited powers to direct the affairs and lives of half a billion people in dozens of countries, from Finland to France and from Ireland to Poland. The Irish responded in the only sensible manner, but European leaders made it perfectly clear that they would press on with the project of dismantling European nation states regardless of popular resistance.

French President Sarkozy and German Chancellor Merkel issued a joint statement saying they “hope that the other member states will continue the process of ratification.” The German Foreign Minister Frank-Walter Steinmeier said: “The ratification process must continue. I am still convinced that we need this treaty.” The British Foreign Secretary David Miliband said the UK would press on with ratification: “It’s right that we continue with our own process.”

The President of the European Parliament Hans-Gert Pöttering stated: “The ratification process must continue” because “the reform of the European Union is important for citizens, for democracy and for transparency.” In other words: The reason the EU is tossing aside the verdict of the Irish people, as well as the French and Dutch people and numerous others who never got the chance to voice their opinion at all, is for “democracy.”

According to writer Martin Helme, it was always clear that the power elites were not going to accept an Irish “no.” After the first shock they would simply continue carrying out plan A:

“One of the most disgusting and outrageous talking points already being peddled by the Eurocrats and their friends in the liberal mainstream media is that 862,415 Irish voters have no right to block the desired goal of some 450 million Europeans. This distortion of truth should never go unchallenged. First of all, those few million Irish were actually the only citizens in Europe who were asked for their opinion. The rest of the 446 or so millions were never consulted. How can any politician claim that their voters want the ratification of EU constitution/Lisbon Treaty when the entire political class emphatically insisted on not asking the people? In fact, in many countries politicians openly admit that their voters would have done the same as Irish did, i.e. vote against the rotten thing. So it is not the few million Irish voters blocking the will of hundreds of millions of other European voters but very clearly a mass of Irish voters against a few thousand politicians and bureaucrats who make up the European power elite. Secondly, what happened to those 20 million French and Dutch voters who said no to the same document three years ago?”

The European Commission in April 2008 presented a new plan aimed at increasing EU citizens’ involvement in the decision-making process of the 27-nation bloc, as well as making it more popular. “We must consult citizens,” said the Swedish Commissioner Margot Wallström then. She is famous for her remark in 2005 that

Europeans needed to approve of the proposed EU constitution or risk a new Holocaust. Three years after the Constitution was first rejected, and still with no Holocaust in sight, the EU no longer pretends to care about the will of the people. When Eurocrats talk about “consulting” citizens, they mean insulting them.

In April 2008, a demonstration comprising people from all walks of life and from most political parties convened in front of the famous and beautiful Staatsoper (State Opera) in the center of Vienna to demonstrate against the ratification of the Lisbon Treaty in the Austrian Parliament, which later occurred without holding a referendum. Opinion polls showed that a majority of Austrians were convinced, as they should be, that policy is determined almost exclusively by Brussels. They see local politicians as largely deprived of any power, and many of them were reluctant to grant even more power to the unaccountable EU.

Opinion polls from mid-2008 showed that a strong majority of the Dutch were still against the Lisbon Treaty, which is virtually identical to the Constitution that Dutch voters rejected by 62 to 38 percent in the 2005 referendum. Nevertheless, the Netherlands is going ahead with the ratification of the Treaty even after the Irish rejected it, said Premier Jan Peter Balkenende. The political elites are determined to continue a process which will essentially dismantle their country and reduce it to just another province in an emerging Eurabian superstate, and openly ignore their own people in order to implement this.

As Helme states, “Governments have willfully and knowingly gone against the will of the people, trashed their own constitutions, corrupted their courts to go along with it (thus trashing the rule of law) and started to govern without the consent of the people or the rule of law....This is the path that leads to revolution. Good! As Thomas Jefferson said ‘The tree of liberty must be refreshed from time to time with the blood of patriots and tyrants.’ I have a feeling that more and more people around Europe are ready for it. How about the politicians?”

### **The EU Undermines Political Legitimacy and Connections between Rulers and the Ruled**

Proponents of the European Union claim that it is a “peace project.” But the EU is not about peace, it is about war: A demographic and cultural war waged against an entire continent, from the Black Sea to the North Sea, in order to destroy European nation states and build an empire run by self-appointed bureaucrats. This is supported by national politicians in order to enhance their personal power, by creating a larger political entity than their individual nation states and by ridding themselves of the constraints of a democratic society. The EU corrupts national political elites into betraying the people they are supposed to serve and protect.

The EU is increasingly dictatorial, but it is a stealth dictatorship whose most dangerous aspects are largely invisible in everyday life. What the average person sees is that it makes it easier for him to travel to other countries without a passport, and use the same Euro currency from Arctic Lapland in Finland to Spain’s Canary Islands off the African coast. This appears convenient, and on some level it is. But it comes at the price of hollowing out the power of national institutions and placing it into the hands of an unelected oligarchy conspiring to usurp ever more power and rearrange the lives of half a billion people. That’s a steep price to pay for a common currency. But people do not clearly see this is their daily lives, and seeing is believing. The enemy that clearly identifies himself as such is sometimes less dangerous than the enemy who is diffused and vague, since you cannot easily mobilize against him.

The insightful British philosopher Roger Scruton in his excellent little book The West and the Rest: Globalization and the Terrorist Threat, some of which is available online for free, warns that the gradual transfer of legislative powers to “international law” embodied in organizations such as the United Nations and the European Union undermines the traditional system of law in Western nations. The ideology and project of Globalism (Scruton does not use this term, but I do) — for it is a deliberate project, make no mistake about it — is presented to Western citizens as an “inevitable” process. Those disagreeing with this are evil racist or ignorant bigots standing against the tide of history. As Scruton says:

“We have reached the stage where our national jurisdiction is bombarded by laws from outside...even though many of them originate in despotic or criminal governments, and even though hardly any of them are concerned with the maintenance of peace. Even so we, the citizens, are powerless to reject these laws, and they, the legislators, are entirely unanswerable to us, who must obey them....The despotism is coming slowly: the anarchy will happen quickly in its wake, when law is finally detached from the experience of membership, becomes ‘theirs’ but not ‘ours’ and so loses all authority in the hearts of those whom it presumes to discipline....our political elites speak and behave as though there were no such choice to be made — just as the

communists did at the time of the Russian Revolution. They refer to an inevitable process, to irreversible changes, and while at times prepared to distinguish a ‘fast’ from a ‘slow’ track into the future, are clear in their minds that these two tracks lead to a single destination — the destination of transnational government, under a common system of law, in which national loyalty will be no more significant than support for a local football team.”

Anthony Coughlan, a senior lecturer at Trinity College in Dublin, Ireland, states the following in an essay at the EU Observer:

“At a national level when a minister wants to get something done, he or she must have the backing of the prime minister, must have the agreement of the minister for finance if it means spending money, and above all must have majority support in the national parliament, and implicitly amongst voters in the country. Shift the policy area in question to the supranational level of Brussels however, where laws are made primarily by the 27-member Council of Ministers, and the minister in question becomes a member of an oligarchy, a committee of lawmakers, the most powerful in history, making laws for 500 million Europeans, and irremovable as a group regardless of what it does. National parliaments and citizens lose power with every EU treaty, for they no longer have the final say in the policy areas concerned. Individual ministers on the other hand obtain an intoxicating increase in personal power, as they are transformed from members of the executive arm of government at national level, subordinate to a national legislature, into EU-wide legislators at the supranational.”

EU ministers see themselves as architects of a superpower in the making, and can free themselves from scrutiny of their actions by elected national parliaments. According to Coughlan, EU integration represents “a gradual coup by government executives against legislatures, and by politicians against the citizens who elect them.” This process sucks the reality of power from “traditional government institutions, while leaving these still formally intact. They still keep their old names — parliament, government, supreme court — so that their citizens do not get too alarmed, but their classical functions have been transformed.”

The European Union is basically an attempt by the elites in European nations to cooperate on usurping power, bypassing and abolishing the democratic system, a slow-motion coup d’état. Ideas such as “promoting peace” or “promoting free trade” are used as a pretext for this, a bone thrown to fool the gullible masses and veil what is essentially a naked power grab.

The European Union is deeply flawed in its basic construction and cannot function as anything other than an increasingly totalitarian pan-European dictatorship, run by a self-appointed oligarchy. Indeed, there is reason to fear that it was designed that way. Power is concentrated heavily in institutions that are above the formal restraints of public consent and above the informal restraints of public scrutiny and insight. EU authorities can do more or less whatever they want to, as they do in relations to the Arab and Islamic world.

### **The EU Spreads a Culture of Lies and Corruption**

In 2005 (and again in 2006), the EU’s financial watchdog refused to approve the EU’s accounts for the 11th year in a row because they were so full of fraud. The European Court of Auditors refused to give a statement of assurance on the EU’s \$160.3 billion budget for 2004. “The vast majority of the payment budget was again materially affected by errors of legality and regularity,” it said. It specifically refused to approve the budgets for the EU’s foreign policy and financial aid programs, many of which are geared towards Arab countries. Half of the project budgets approved by the European Commission were inadequately monitored.

The European Commission, frequently diffused through a complicated web of innocent-sounding organizations, create agreements with Arabs and then quietly implement them as federal EU policy. This is accomplished because billions of Euros are floating around in a system with little outside control, and with a few powerful individuals and groups pulling the strings. Native Europeans are in effect financing their continent’s merger with, in reality colonization by, the Islamic world without their knowledge and without their consent. It must be the first time in human history that an entire continent is being culturally eradicated with bureaucratic precision. This represents perhaps the greatest betrayal in the history of Western civilization, yet is largely ignored by the mainstream media in most Western nations.

After Irish voters had clearly rejected the Lisbon Treaty (the slightly changed, but otherwise recycled version

of the European Constitution which had been rejected by French and Dutch voters earlier), Prime Minister Anders Fogh Rasmussen of Denmark said Ireland should be given less than nine months to work out its problems with the Lisbon Treaty prior to the EU's parliamentary elections in 2009. Rasmussen said that the Irish "no" vote to the Constitution should not stop further work by the Union toward getting the treaty ratified. European leaders, including Danish ones, have generally preferred ratification of the EU Constitution without popular referendums because they know there is powerful resistance to it in many countries. It is meaningless to have referendums if they only come when the elites want them to, and these elites can ignore them if they dislike the results.

Mr. Rasmussen is a great example of how the European Union slowly destroys the democratic system and is deliberately designed to do so. He is supposed to follow the will of and interests of his people, but his actual loyalty lies with the rest of the EU oligarchy. He's by no means the worst person among EU leaders; this isn't about his personal flaws, it's about the EU and how it eventually corrupts even otherwise decent individuals.

The EU is a slow-motion coup d'état conducted against dozens of countries simultaneously. It is designed to empty all organs subjected to the popular will of any real power and transfer it into the hands of an unelected oligarchy. In fact, it's worse than a coup d'état because this traditionally implied that a group of people seized control over a country. The EU doesn't just want to seize control over nation states; it wants to abolish them. The EU is organized treason.

The EU elites react as one when faced with challenges to their power base from ordinary people. Participants at every level of the system get well-paid jobs for taking part in it, which means that their pragmatic interests lie with maintaining it. Most of those who know the true nature of the EU have been bribed by the system and remain silent regarding its abuses because they personally benefit from it. Their loyalty has been bought — with the tax money of European citizens — and transferred from their people, where it theoretically should be, to the EU. The EU is their pension plan. When you challenge the EU, you thus constitute a direct threat to their personal financial interests, and they will respond accordingly. The EU can bribe the national elites by appealing to their vanity and sense of importance, by elevating them from a national to an "international level" and by giving them nice cars and fancy jobs with power unrestrained by silly prosaic things such as the will of the people. Just like the Soviet Union, the European Union promotes a culture of lies and corruption which starts at the top and filters down to society as a whole.

Dutchman Derk-Jan Eppink, who has worked behind the scenes of the European Commission, sees a number of similarities between the European Union and the late Soviet Union. The EUSSR, just like the USSR, is administered by a self-appointed political elite from a single bureaucratic center. Its leaders profess belief in a Utopian state. The Soviet Union saw Socialist integration as an irreversible process. The European Union sees integration as a means for an "ever closer Union." The Soviet Union claimed to act on behalf of a mythical worker. The European Union has its mythical citizen. Eppink concluded the comparison: "All in all, the Soviet Union lacked the self-correcting forces and the self-criticism which are proper to the democratic process. The European Union lacks these properties in the same way. By setting targets which are either too far away or unrealistic, you are undermining the legitimacy of the project and of the institutions which have to implement these policies. With this book, I want to warn for *imperial overstretch* and for the creation of expectations which are far-fetched and unrealistic. Sometimes I have the impression that the European Union is moving towards the same trap that finished the Soviet Union."

According to writer Christopher Booker, "when Richard North and I were writing a history of the European Union, trawling hundreds of books and thousands of documents, nothing struck us more than how consistently this grandiose project has been built on deceit as to its true nature (hence our title, *The Great Deception*). It is more than 60 years since one of its progenitors, Altiero Spinelli, wrote that its aim should be stealthily to assemble the components of a supranational government and only to declare its true purpose at the end of the process by unveiling a 'constitution'. It is more than 50 years since another founder, Paul-Henri Spaak, advised Jean Monnet, who was above all 'the Father of Europe', that the only way to achieve their goal — a politically integrated Europe — was to pretend that it was only a 'Common Market'."

Danish EU-critic Henrik Ræder Clausen, who is behind the Europe News website, has reviewed the book The Great Deception by Christopher Booker and Richard North. In the early stages, Jean Monnet was seemingly always at the right place and with the right contacts. The first ideas for a European Union were born after the senseless destruction brought about during the First World War, but they were only implemented after the



## Second World War:

“The initial ideas for the European Union stem from the period after WWI (not WWII), where the catastrophe just experienced had made a deep impression, and had seeded the ground for trying out new ideas. The League of Nations was one such idea, creating an intergovernmental body to deal with international conflicts, and hopefully to preserve the peace. The various players, Monnet, Salter, and later Spinelli, drafted their first ideas immediately after WWI, in an effort to preclude a repeat of this, possibly the most meaningless war in history. Even the basic structure of the Union, modeled after the League of Nations, was drafted out at this early stage.”

Monnet, who had been doing business and making contacts during WW2, resumed his efforts after the war. He eventually realized that there was little opportunity to make European citizens give up their nation states voluntarily, so in 1954 he changed his strategy. Instead of aiming directly for a supranational Union, Monnet and his allies opted for an Economic Community instead, which gradually evolved over several decades.

According to Clausen, “At this point (the Maastricht Treaty), we are faced with one of the most significant deceptions of the European Union project: It was sold to the European citizens as an economic community, not as a political union. By implementing the political union in small steps, and not making the final goal clear to the public except at a very late stage, the Community founders had pulled off one of the greatest deceptions in history, effectively decoupling the progress from democratic scrutiny and criticism. 1992 marks the end of the European Economic Community and the (troubled) birth of the European Union.”

Is the European Union exclusively bad? There are two schools of thought: Those who believe that the EU represents an idea that was initially good but went awfully wrong somewhere along the way, and those who believe the EU was flawed from its very inception; most people just didn't see it for what it was. I am willing to listen to the arguments of both camps, but the lies by Mr. Monnet and others do indicate that the EU was steeped in lies and deception from the very first moment of its creation. Either way, this question is by now of secondary importance. What matters at the moment is that the EU has become a monster which threatens the very continued existence of European civilization in any recognizable form.

I am not in any way suggesting that the EU is the only cause of the challenges we are now facing; merely that it constitutes our biggest problem, blocks the solution to other problems and adds several new ones. Political Correctness, suicidal Multiculturalism and Globalism rule the entire Western world, and the low birth rates we have among native Europeans are not caused by the EU. There is a new sense of European solidarity which can be useful in the future. It is quite possible that we could indeed benefit from some form of European cooperation in defense of a shared civilization, but not in the form of the EU as it exists today.

I would like to reform the EU if I could, but I fear that Vladimir Bukovsky is right and that it is the kind of structure which cannot be reformed. There is an incredible amount of frustration, fear and anger simmering among ordinary people across much of Western Europe which is artificially held down by the authorities and the media. There is a possibility that there will be a counter-reaction once the EU is dismantled, but I don't think we have much of a choice in the present situation. I would liken it to having emergency surgery in order to save your life. If you have the choice between certain death now and possible complications later, you would normally choose possible complications later.

The European Union is not about cooperation for protecting the best interests of Europeans; it is about turning the entire continent into a Multicultural theme park while the natives get culturally deconstructed and demographically crushed. The EU is a large-scale social experiment conducted on hundreds of millions of people. It is not about economics of scale, it is about stupidity of scale. The EU system corrupts virtually everybody who comes close to it. It cannot be reformed, it can only be dismantled.



## The EU and the Globalist Alliance

*This essay was first published at the Gates of Vienna blog in August 2007. It is republished here with some changes.*

One of my challenges when analyzing what's wrong with the modern West has been trying to figure out the doctrines of Multiculturalism. In Marxism you have the writings of Marx, Engels and others which provide a (seemingly) coherent idea system. In contrast, there is no Multicultural founding document or philosophy. Multicultural doctrines are remarkably inconsistent. The only thing consistent about them is a seeming desire to break down European culture and Western nations. It is possible to trace elements of it to the Frankfurt school of cultural Marxism, to Rousseau's noble savage etc., but in the end it's remarkably vague. Perhaps Multiculturalism was intended to sound vaguely positive but confusing, a convenient smokescreen for the project, imposed from above, of dismantling Western nation states. It is plausible that some groups used it as a cover for implementing sweeping changes that could not be openly debated and were frequently the exact opposite of the stated goals. Mass immigration was presented as "enriching our culture." In fact, it diluted it, and that was probably the point. However, as with all ideologies there were both True Believers who really believed in its ideas and cynics who used it for ulterior motives.

Here is an interesting comment about Multiculturalism posted at a website in, of all places, Bangladesh:

"Multiculturalism is an unnatural and unhealthy condition that can only afflict countries in national decline.... Greed and corruption will characterise the government coupled with oppressive measures directed against its citizens. Lies and deceit will be the stock and trade of media, politicians, and educational institutions." It "is used to prevent a national consensus among the electorate. It erodes values, cultures, beliefs, religions, ethnic habits, etc. ensuring a swirling river of discontent upon which the multiculturalists rides. It is a perfect method of ensuring that there can never be accord, unity, or a commonly shared destiny among those ruled."

In other words: Multiculturalism is a tool for divide and conquer. Is there then any point in trying to comprehend its logic at all? Maybe it was just a convenient excuse used for disrupting the established order of nation states by flooding them with mass immigration under the cover of "cultural diversity" or historical inevitability. If that is the case, there never was any coherent logic behind it, so we shouldn't waste our time looking for one.

This was undertaken by a coalition of different groups with a shared Globalist goal of undermining Western nation states. I heard supporters of mass immigration a generation ago state that all this talk about how it would change our societies into the unrecognizable was scare-mongering and racism. Now, the same groups are saying that yes, our societies have been changed forever. It's good, and it's anyway too late to do anything about it, so get used to it! Their propaganda was used to deceive the public and keep it off balance in order to implement potentially irreversible changes with little real debate. They knew they would never get the permission to destroy their own countries, so they simply didn't ask.

By dismantling national borders, the EU has facilitated the largest migration waves in European history. When Poland became a member, many Poles moved to Britain, Germany etc. This left Poland with a labor shortage. They are now considering importing workers from the Ukraine and Russia to compensate for the Poles that left. At the same time, native Brits are fleeing to Spain because they don't feel at home in Britain anymore. By such moves, you unleash a chain migration that will eventually smash nations that have existed for ages. Yet this intra-European migration pales in comparison to the immigration from developing nations. The end result will — supposedly — be an entire continent of people without any strong sense of cultural identity or national loyalty, who will be divided, disoriented and presumably easier to control. Stalin did similar things in the Soviet Union, moving large population groups around to unsettle the state and keep it disunited. The European Union has learned a lot from Stalin.

The First World War laid the foundations for the Second World War because it sowed the seeds of resentment in Germany; seeds which bloomed after the Great Depression started in 1929 and led to the rise of the Nazis. It also led to the Russian Revolution and thus to the establishment of Soviet Communism and the Cold War. The combined legacy of the anti-nationalism born out of WW1, the principle of total non-discrimination established after WW2, and the model of an artificial, post-Christian, authoritarian superstate inherited from

the Soviet Union are all embodied in the European Union.

Less than a generation after the Cold War ended we are entering a new world war, caused by Western weakness and the resurgent Jihad. The connection between the Cold War and the current world war is not as strong as between WW1 and WW2, but it exists. The West in the 1990s was relieved that the prospect of a global nuclear war was over. We let our guard down because we were reluctant to engage immediately in another ideological confrontation, and this allowed Muslims the opportunity to quietly infiltrate our countries. Hard-Leftists groups within the West, some of which had been actively encouraged by the Soviet Union and the KGB during the Cold War, also regrouped after the latter's collapse. Moreover, Arabs had been supported by the Soviet Union in the 1970s against Israel and the USA, and Muslims had in return been supported by the Americans against the Soviets in the 1980s in Afghanistan, where Jihadists such as Osama bin Laden learned their trade. Jihad was thus for a while pandered to by both superpowers.

At the American Thinker, [James Lewis](#) writes that “Europe has given up on electoral democracy” at the highest and most powerful levels. “For the elites, the emerging EU-SSR is great, because rather than being a minor bureaucrat in London you get the chance to rule all of Europe, with bigger salaries, better food, and richer lobbyists, right across the Channel in the trendy new Euro-capital of Brussels. All you need is to make your regulations so complicated that nobody can understand them.” He believes Europeans are in a state of quiet mourning because of the planned euthanasia of their nation states: “Wall-to-wall elite propaganda has accomplished what a thousand years of European wars and treaties never did. Europe is being hammered and melded into an artificial unity.” This sense of doomed national identity puts a different light on the anti-American neurosis that runs through much of European media.

Lewis dubs the EU “government by hyper-complexity.” Former Italian Prime Minister [Giuliano Amato](#), one of the chief architects behind the EU Constitution, admits that the “amending treaty” that is supposed to replace the rejected Constitution (yet is 95% identical to it) was deliberately drafted to make it too complicated for the average citizen to understand: “They [EU leaders] decided that the document should be unreadable. If it is unreadable, it is not constitutional, that was the sort of perception.”

Western Europeans had already accepted steadily increasing powers to the national nanny states for decades. All the EU had to do was to connect these established bureaucratic machineries on a supranational level into a complicated web virtually impenetrable to the average person. Only the skilled specialists and bureaucrats can maneuver within this maze, leaving great, and largely unrecognized and thus formally and informally unrestrained power, in the hands of the few on top pulling the strings.

According to [José Manuel Barroso](#), the Portuguese President of the European Commission, the EU is “the first non-imperial empire” the world has ever seen, which makes me wonder whether he has ever read the tale of *The Emperor's New Clothes* by Hans Christian Andersen. If the EU is an “empire” of anything, it is above all an empire of bureaucrats, made possible because it was established in a culture where bureaucrats already ruled.

Another person with grandiose ideas about the EU (and himself) is former French President [Valéry Giscard d'Estaing](#), who has compared his role in drafting the EU Constitution to that of the Founding Fathers of the United States. Unfortunately, Mr. Giscard is no Thomas Jefferson or James Madison and has apparently understood very little of the American Constitution. Precisely because some Americans were concerned that too much power was granted to the federal government, the Bill of Rights was instituted to ensure the rights of individual citizens. On balance, the US Constitution does create a powerful federal government, but it has decentralized rule and leaves large room for individual liberty. Simply put, the citizens grant the state the right to perform certain tasks on their behalf.

Contrast this with the massive EU Constitution where the state “grants you” certain rights, not including the right to genuine free speech. The Americans and the British have their flaws but I admit I am in favor of the traditional Anglo-American model of limitations on state power, not the French one. I don't like the idea of an all-powerful state that “grants” you rights. If the state “grants” you rights, it can presumably also revoke them at a later point. It tells you something about the perceived relationship between citizens and the state: The state isn't here to serve us. We are here to serve the state.

The Canadian newspaper columnist [David Warren](#) writes about the “charter of fundamental rights” included

in the proposed EU Constitution:

“It is time people realized that ‘human rights codes’ are a weapon employed by the state to suppress disapproved behaviour by the individual. They cannot be wielded by the individual against the state, as independent civil and criminal courts could be. They are star chambers used, and designed to be used, to mount show trials, in which persons who fail to snap to attention when commissar issues the latest political corrections may be publicly demonized. By removing all of their victims’ established legal protections — presumption of innocence, the right to know one’s accuser, to be tried by a jury of one’s peers, et cetera — they put a jackboot directly in the teeth of the tradition of human liberty descending from Magna Carta. The tribunals are created, always, by bureaucratic fiat. Democracy is not quite dead in Europe, but getting that way. The cumbersome, incompetent, ridiculously corrupt, incredibly arrogant, and unelected Euro-bureaucracy is already in a position to dictate trans-European policies that by-pass all national legislatures.”

Stanley Kurtz of the National Review Online reviews historian Walter Laqueur’s book *The Last Days of Europe: Epitaph for an Old Continent*:

“Laqueur returns several times to the failure of Europe’s authorities to consult with the public on immigration. Instead of putting the matter up for debate, government and corporations quietly and unilaterally set policy. Europe’s elite had a bad conscience, given memories of refugees from Nazi Germany who’d been turned away decades earlier. There was also the omnipresent ‘fear of being accused of racism.’ This bizarre combination of multiculturalism and complete disregard for the significance of culture opened up a huge gulf between Europe’s elite and the public — a gulf that emerged openly when France and The Netherlands rejected the proposed EU constitution (in part over concerns about Muslim immigration and the accession of Turkey to the EU). There was, says Laqueur, ‘a backlash against the elites who wanted to impose their policies on a population who had not been consulted.’“

Kurtz wonders what the European elites were thinking when they implemented these policies: “To the question ‘Did they imagine that uncontrolled immigration would not involve major problems?’ Laqueur responds that it is unanswerable. (My guess is that, like today’s market-based immigration advocates in America, European leaders were focused on the immediate need for labor and gave little if any thought to long-term social consequences.)”

Initially in the 1960s, the first trickle of Muslim and other immigration probably wasn’t planned by anybody. It was an accidental result of de-colonization and a desire for short-term labor in booming economies. As I have demonstrated before, this turned into a far more organized cooperation between European and Muslim countries from the 1970s onwards.

Why do ordinary Europeans put up with this? Are we perfectly content with allowing others to run our lives as long as we have food on our table and can still go for a weekend holiday to some exotic resort every now and then?

The primary weapon of the EU has always been deceit, hiding behind labels such as peace and free trade zone. This has worked rather well. I know from personal experience that most Europeans honestly don’t have any idea just how elaborate the Eurabian networks are, or how much EU authorities are selling them out. Many believe it is a crazy conspiracy theory if you point it out to them, just like it was dismissed as scare-mongering earlier if you claimed that this “free trade zone with a few added extras” would eventually morph into a superstate that is subverting the democratic system and unsettling the stability of the entire continent.

Still, the EU-federalists must rely on something else in those cases when this proves insufficient. Their secondary weapon is first of all the common Western respect for law. The reluctance to stage rebellions could be counted upon to prevent serious opposition, especially if combined with a high degree of bureaucracy-induced apathy. Western Europeans have been subjected to an explosion of regulations of every kind. This matters little to those who come from cultures where laws are only abided by if backed up by brute force, but to Westerners, restrained by their cultural sense of fair play, and to Western Europeans emasculated by state propaganda and bureaucracy, this has had a damaging effect.

Western Europeans were used to laws being passed with their best interests in mind, because by and large they had been. Within a few years, all of this has changed. Laws are now passed by EU bureaucrats who don’t

give a damn about their interests and by elites who view them as potential stumbling blocks for the new Multicultural society. Yet Europeans, by and large, still adhere to the laws and regulations that are passed by the state because they were accustomed to doing so. Ordinary Europeans are thus held hostage by their own law-abiding nature while the state turns increasingly hostile. This situation may not last forever, though.

The system in Western Europe is based on a minimal use of force. In fact, the armed forces are so weak that in a different age these countries would have been conquered long ago. The situation has only remained stable because of the American military umbrella in Europe, which has provided Western Europeans with an artificial sense of security and aided the growth of Utopian and unsustainable ideologies.

The EU is frequently described as toothless and impotent, but this is inaccurate. It is both unwilling and unable to defend Europeans against external aggressors, but the system is quite capable of subverting the freedom of Europeans. The problem isn't that the system is powerless, but that it rewards those who use violence while punishing those who don't. Native Europeans will be ignored or silenced if they try through peaceful means to protest against mass immigration or the ever-expanding pan-European superstate. Violent Muslims, at home and abroad, will get immediate concessions and respect while Europeans are treated with increasing contempt and hostility from those who are supposed to be their leaders.

Lee Harris warns against those who dismiss the idea that Jihad constitutes a serious threat to the West because we are technologically superior to the Islamic world:

"...fear of anarchy — the ultimate fear for those who embrace the politics of reason — can be used to paralyze the political process to the point at which the established order is helpless to control events through normal political channels and power is no longer in the hands of the establishment but lies perilously in the streets....The jihadists do not need to 'win' in the battle against the West; it is enough if they can force the West to choose between a dreaded plunge back into the Law of the Jungle and acceding to their demands. This is a formula that has worked many times before and may work again."

Harris calls this approach the *crash* of civilization.

If left unchanged, this could sooner or later lead to an outbreak of violence among native Europeans because the system itself rewards violence, and a system that does so invites more violence. If this results in a popular explosion, I don't think future generations will wonder why it happened; they will wonder why it didn't happen sooner. At some point, people are going to turn to somebody, anybody, promising to protect their lives, property and culture.

An online document from 2005 written by Traugott Schoeffthaler, Executive Director of the Anna Lindh Euro-Mediterranean Foundation for the Dialogue between Cultures, one of the EU's most important instruments for Eurabian cultural cooperation, states the following:

"Theodor W. Adorno and Alfred Horkheimer, in their studies on 'The Authoritarian Personality' published shortly after 1945 as a first analysis of the cult of power and violence in Nazi Germany, went deep into psychological terminology of ego- and ethnocentrism. Javier Pérez de Cuéllar and Amin Maalouf come to similar conclusions: Cultural policies need to avoid schematic concepts such as the popular distinction between 'Us' and 'Them'. They even warn against further using the term of 'The Other' which is standard in almost all intercultural education concepts, since it opens the gate for imposing collective identities on the individual. There is no viable alternative to their proposal of adopting a rights-based approach in dealing with cultural diversity."

The document further states that the objective of "learning to live together" (one of the Eurabian slogans) "was outlined by the World Commission on Education for the 21st Century chaired by the former President of the European Commission Jacques Delors. Formal education systems are to be geared towards learning environments, teachers from instructors to organisers of learning, schools to centres for daily practice of tolerance by giving way to others' points of view."

Moreover, in line with the report by Mr. Delors, the influential French President of the EU Commission from 1985 to 95, "values... cannot be taught in the strict sense: the desire to impose from the outside predetermined values comes down in the end to negating them."



In plain words: European schoolchildren should be taught to “give up” their cultural identity. Since it is unlikely that it will be required, or accepted, by Muslims to do the same thing, this amounts to unilaterally stripping the cultural identity away from Europeans, thus leaving them defenseless when confronted with a demographically expanding Islamic community.

According to this logic, “identity” in the widest possible sense is the root cause of all conflicts. Consequently, one must assume that if you erase all racial, religious, national and cultural differences, you will end wars. This is strikingly similar to the view of Communists, who envisioned that by erasing economic differences you would end wars. All peoples should gradually be merged into one, if necessary against their will, starting with Western nations.

Richard N. Gardner, Globalist thinker, former US ambassador and currently a professor of law, in Foreign Affairs in 1974 outlined a strategy for gradually eroding national sovereignty through creating “institutions of limited jurisdiction and selected membership.” Gardner thought that such “an end run around national sovereignty, eroding it piece by piece” would “accomplish much more than the old-fashioned frontal assault.” He was a member of the Trilateral Commission, which consists of hundreds of powerful individuals from Europe, Asia and North America devoted to promoting closer ties between states, from 1974 to 2005.

I keep bashing Marxists in my writings, and they usually deserve it. I honestly believe it is impossible to write anything meaningful about what ails Europe without taking the prolonged and highly destructive influences of Marxism into account. Still, Marxists are simply not powerful enough by themselves to generate all the problems we are now facing. You would have to be pretty blind not to see the importance of business ties in relations between the West and the Islamic world, certainly in the case of Europe and the Middle East, but also with the United States and Saudi Arabia. Money makes the world go around, after all.

One does not have to be a Socialist to see that the short-term interests of Big Business are not always identical to the long-term interests of the nation as a whole, especially not when it comes to immigration. Multinational corporations, which by their very definition have loyalty towards no nation, should not be allowed to direct national immigration policies.

There are several perspectives one can use when trying to understand the European Union. One is that it is somehow related to the unaccountable bureaucracy of the Soviet Union. This does make some sense, but on the other hand, the EU cannot be properly understood simply as a Marxist organization. It has always held the backing of Big Business interests who want easy access to greater markets. They do not always care about national sovereignty or borders, which are vital to the continued existence of any free society. I am particularly concerned over attempts by various Western corporations to appease Islamic demands for censorship. Both with the Danish cartoons and Geert Wilders’ movie *Fitna*, business interests were among the most prominent in denouncing these attempts to defend our freedom because they care only about their market shares and not about the wider issues.

According to the intelligent American blog reader Queen, “What we have today is not ‘capitalism!’ It’s fascism. The word fascism is used so much today that we have forgotten it’s original meaning. The real meaning is simply an economic system in which corporations, labor unions and governments all cooperate to create a totalitarian state. In which case, the government gets all totalitarian so it can screw the multi-nationals’ competitors and potential competitors, as well as us, ‘the little guy.’ In the 1930s, it was supposed to be the ‘Third Way’ between liberal capitalism and Communism. No coincidence then that Tony Blair called his system of government, which combines elements of cultural Marxism with corporate fascism, the ‘Third Way.’”

Mass immigration of unskilled people from developing countries is not beneficial for the country as a whole in the long run. The borderless world benefits the super-rich, who can exploit cheap labor and gain access to greater markets. They can spend some of the money they earn from this to retreat, at least for a while, into gated communities to escape the rising insecurity and ethnic tensions brought about by mass immigration. Being mobile, they can move their fortunes formally to nations with low tax levels and let average citizens, the vast majority of the population, foot the bill in the form of rising tensions and rising taxes to pay for health care and education for unskilled immigrants.



This is similar to left-wing parties importing voters and undermining Western nations in favor of whatever version of Utopia is fashionable at the time. It is more than a little ironic that Socialists and the super-rich are allies, not adversaries, in undermining nation states. In general, it is useful to think of an alliance between global capitalism, global Marxism as well as what could be termed global authoritarianism in the sense of unelected individuals working towards a world federal government. It is not just a conspiracy theory; I have read several EU adherents who stated that if we can create a government on a pan-European level, we can create a government on a global level.

Many members of the Western political elites don't identify with their nations. Left-wingers tend to believe that society should be similar to a non-governmental organization (NGO) and run by a world government, a strengthened version of the United Nations. Some business-oriented right-wingers consider the ideal to be a multinational corporation and think that a country should be run the same way. Just as you in a corporation should be allowed to hire whoever you want, you should be allowed to import whoever you want in this ex-nation-state-turned-corporation.

It is as if the entire political, economic and cultural establishment throughout the Western world, left, centre and right, woke up one day and decided that we now live in the global age, that all cultural and religious differences are irrelevant and that the age of nation states is over. Consequently, we shouldn't even try to uphold our borders. Those suggesting otherwise are racists and bigots.

To say that the USA currently has a border resembling a Swiss cheese is an insult to Swiss cheese. The "conservative" President George W. Bush doesn't care one whit about the United States as an actual nation, only as an abstract idea, which puts him squarely in the mainstream of Western leaders. Was he bribed by business interests to keep the border open? Do his family and members of his administration have too close business ties to the Saudis to do anything substantial about Islam? Mr. Bush appears to get positively offended when people suggest that he should do more to uphold the country's borders against illegal immigration.

This is one scenario that the US Founding Fathers did not foresee: They were scared of the short-sightedness of the average and presumably unenlightened citizen, which is sometimes justified. However, the mass immigration that is now destabilizing the West has been pushed more by the political and cultural elites than by average citizens. Those in favor of the 1965 Immigration Act assured the public that it wouldn't change the demographic make-up of the USA, but it did, and some of them were probably fully aware of this. They just lied.

When I criticize democracy, this should not be taken as an indication that I believe in elitist rule. I criticize it because it clearly doesn't automatically ensure freedom of speech and security for life and property, which is the hallmark of true liberty. Another problem is that it isn't always the best system for long-term decisions because people tend to prefer short-term gains. I still believe, however, that there should be a powerful element of real public influence, to curtail the potential for absolute rulers and abuse of power. We have clearly veered too far in the direction of the latter with the EU, where the ruling elites have skillfully eliminated any constraints on their power.

British philosopher Roger Scruton thinks that "buying and selling of citizenship, often to people who think of it purely as a right and never as a duty, is common throughout Europe. The political élite sees nothing wrong in people collecting passports as they might collect memberships of clubs." Members of our liberal élite may be immune to xenophobia, but there is an equal fault which they exhibit in abundance, which is the repudiation and fear of home. Scruton calls this oikophobia:

"The rise of oikophobes has led to the growing crisis of legitimacy in the nation states of Europe. The ordinary people of Europe are now deeply anxious about their future. ...If the liberal élite will not discuss the matter, and continue to put all blame for the growing anxiety on the xenophobia of the indigenous population while ignoring the oikophobia which is an equal contributory cause, then the likely long-term effect will be a popular explosion."

The democratic system has significant flaws, but it worked to some extent as long as there was sense of being a *demos*, a people with a shared identity and common interests. What we are witnessing now is the gradual breakdown of this *demos*, starting from the top down. Powerful groups frequently have more in common with the elites in other countries than they have with the average citizen in their own. If you no longer believe in

your nation as a real entity with a specific culture, it simply becomes a tool for obtaining power, a stepping stone for your global career. Without a pre-political loyalty, emotional ties or even a pragmatic interest in supporting nation states, the democratic system becomes a vehicle for distributing favors to your friends at home and abroad, for fleecing the voters while in power and hopefully ensuring a lucrative international career along the way. You will have few moral inhibitions against importing voters from abroad for maintaining power or because your business buddies who give you financial support desire this. This process has gone further in the self-loathing West than in any other civilization.

Average citizens who still identify with their nation states thus keep electing people who betray their trust. Since the elites identify little with the nations they are supposed to serve, more power to them will only make matters worse, as it already has in Europe. Corrupt and incompetent individuals will always exist. If you get a corrupt leader every now and then you are dealing with a flawed individual. If you constantly, again and again, get corrupt leaders you are dealing with a flawed system.

Our political system is now deeply flawed. The problem is that I cannot easily see how to fix it.

## The Immigration Tsunami, Part 2

by Baron Bodissey (*Gates of Vienna*) October 12, 2008

I wrote last month about the growing immigration crisis in Southern Europe. In the weeks since that post the emergency hasn't abated; if anything, it has increased. Every day brings a fresh batch of news stories about illegal immigrants landing in Lampedusa, or overwhelming holding facilities in Malta, or being drowned at sea. Despite the acknowledged problem of illegal migrants, Spain is actually *inviting* farm laborers into the country — this during a recession, and with unemployment reaching new levels.

The material below is compiled from various articles which will appear in tonight's news feed. It's important to remember that this is just *one day's selection*. News stories like them appear almost every day, although most of them won't be found in the European MSM [mainstream media].

The EU has actually recognized that it has an illegal immigration problem, and is attempting to cope with it. The latest effort involves a European Coast Guard, which is intended to replace a previous effort which was acknowledged a failure:

*"The creation of a European Coastguard is one of the hypotheses the EU must take into consideration to deal with the illegal immigration emergency in the Mediterranean. The Prime Minister of Greece, Kostas Karamanlis, said this during a joint press conference with the Premier of Malta, Lawrence Gonzi, during his 2-day State visit to the island. "Frontex must be reinforced, not abandoned" said Karamanlis, in response to a question in which he was asked to comment the recent statements of mission leader Ilka Laitinen, who in an interview admitted that the joint patrols have "failed". Karamanlis underlined the importance of more cooperation between the EU member States in dealing with the immigration emergency, inviting European partners to start a discussion on the possibility to create a European Coastguard."*

If the EU has designated the current situation an "emergency", can you imagine how bad it must be?

Part of the problem is that all this immigration from Africa is actually *planned*; it's just that the immigrants are jumping the queue a little bit. According to The Daily Express:

*"More than 50 million African workers are to be invited to Europe in a far-reaching secretive migration deal, the Daily Express can reveal today. A controversial taxpayer-funded 'job centre' opened in Mali this week is just the first step towards promoting "free movement of people in Africa and the EU". Brussels economists claim Britain and other EU states will 'need' 56 million immigrant workers between them by 2050 to make up for the "demographic decline" due to falling birth rates and rising death rates across Europe...'Having sufficient people of working age is vital for the economy and for **tax revenue**.' [emphasis added]"*

This is the crux of the matter: tax revenue. Despite all the statistical evidence indicating that immigrants absorb more tax revenues than they generate, the elites that run the system persist in the belief that the influx is economically necessary.

Their larger goal is the preservation of the system over which they preside. Those who have children surely want their offspring to partake of the same privileges that they enjoy, and perhaps someday set their hands to the same levers of power. In order to do that, the lumpen proletariat must remain a part of the system, and it matters not a whit if they are "brown" and Muslim, just so long as the power and perks continue to accrue to those at the top of the heap.

Ms Castex said: *"It is urgent that member states have a calm approach to immigration. To say 'yes', we need immigration ... it is not a new development, we must accept it."*

**WE MUST ACCEPT IT.**

It is pre-ordained. We do not have a choice. What has been decided is what will come to be. No voice crying in the wilderness will deflect us from the plan.

So: we (that is, native Europeans) have agreed to replace ourselves gradually with Muslim immigrants from Africa.

The news article above terms the plan “secretive” rather than “secret”, because it’s not a secret. It may not be blazoned on the front pages of the continent’s newspapers, or printed up on handbills and pasted on lampposts, but it’s not a secret. The plans are part of the public record, buried in cubic miles of the bureaucratic bumf that has emerged from all the planning sessions in Strasbourg or Brussels.

It’s EuroMed, a.k.a. the Mediterranean Union, a.k.a. the Barcelona Agreement of 1995, a.k.a. Eurabia. And if you’re a European, it’s coming to your city, town, or village, no matter how far you are from Lampedusa, or Valletta, or Gibraltar.

The impoverished indigenes of Africa have caught wind of what lies ahead, and they’re not waiting for an official invitation: they’re coming to Europe now:

*“51 illegal Moroccan immigrants arrived yesterday in Barcelona on an Italian passenger ship and tried to enter into Spanish territory with false documents and were arrested when they got off the ship by national police officers.”*

And they’re willing to take some risks getting to the promised land:

*“Searches are taking place along the coastline of Spain on the lookout for around 50 migrants of Moroccan origin, who (according to a survivor) were involved in a shipwreck. The survivor was found on a beach 40 kilometres north of Rabat, near to the body of a man — presumably one of the victims of the wreck. According to Moroccan security sources cited by EFE news agency, the survivor is a young man — originally from Sale (Rabat). According to his testimony, the boat had fifty people on board when it set sail from the Moroccan coast at around 11.30pm on Tuesday night.”*

Those numbers were in the dozens; how about hundreds ?

*“A large boat with 260 immigrants on board was aided 40 miles south of Lampedusa by Police patrol boats. The boat, 15 meters long was pointed out by the Sirio patrol boat that had previously collected another 143 non EU citizens on three other boats. With the arrival of the last 400 migrants on the island the situation remains critical in the centre where this morning about 1500 people were hosted in a structure that has a capacity for 700 people.”*

Or even tens of thousands:

*“A total 30,000 illegal immigrants have entered Italy so far this year, the country’s Interior Minister, Roberto Maroni told the Parliament on Thursday, adding that migration has risen “exponentially”. The Government has allocated seven million euros for the construction of new reception centres for illegal immigrants and over 109 million euros to run these centres, said Maroni. On top of these sums, the Government has earmarked 747,000 euros to handle the arrival of illegal immigrants at Italy’s borders, he said....Migration to Italy has risen “exponentially” from 500,000 people in 1987 to almost 3.5 million this year, Maroni noted. He was speaking the same day that Italy’s central statistics agency ISTAT released data showing a record 3,432,651 foreigners were resident in Italy on 1 January this year, an increase of 16.8 percent over 2007.”*

So many immigrants are flooding into Malta that their rate of arrival exceeds the local birth rate:

*“The impact of immigrant arrivals on the island-state of Malta is so high that for the first time it has surpassed the birth rate. The statistics which were supplied by the Immigration Commission show that in Malta there are 40 immigrants for every square kilometre, an average that surprisingly surpasses the population density per square kilometre in Finland.”*

And remember: this sort of thing is happening every day, day after day, all along the Mediterranean littoral of Southern Europe.

Nothing approaching this has ever happened in peacetime during all of recorded history. No civilization has peacefully allowed itself to be supplanted by migrants.

So there's no way foretell exactly how all of this will shake out. Still, I feel confident in making a single prediction:

*This will not end well.*



## Stupidity Without Borders — The Alliance of Utopias

*The bulk of this essay was published in July 2006. It is republished here with some changes.*

*“One day, millions of men will leave the Southern Hemisphere to go to the Northern Hemisphere. And they will not go there as friends. Because they will go there to conquer it. And they will conquer it with their sons. The wombs of our women will give us victory.” — Former Algerian President Houari Boumedienne in a [speech](#) at the UN in 1974.*

*“Soon we will take power in this country. Those who criticize us now, will regret it. They will have to serve us. Prepare, for the hour is near.” — [Belgium-based imam](#) in 1994.*

The 20th and the beginning of the 21st centuries have witnessed the most spectacular population growth in human history, most of it in Third World countries. The world’s population, estimated at [6.4 billion](#) in 2006, grows by more than 70 million people per year. In sixty years, Brazil’s population has increased by 318 per cent; Ethiopia’s by [503 per cent](#). There are now 73 million people in Ethiopia — more than the population of Britain or France.

At the same time, many of the most economically successful countries, both in the East and in the West, have problems with ageing or declining populations. At its peak around 1910, one-quarter of the world’s population lived in Europe or North America. Today the percentage has probably declined to about one-eighth. [South Korea’s](#) birthrate has dropped to the point where the average Korean woman is expected to have only one child throughout her life. The U.S. still has a birthrate of more than two, while the U.K. saw births inch up from 1.63 to 1.74 and Germany from 1.34 to 1.37 in the same period. The low birthrate problem in Asia is rooted in [women’s rising](#) social and economic standing. Japan’s birthrate was 1.28, comparable to Taiwan’s 1.22, and Hong Kong’s 0.94.

“Europe and Japan are now facing a population problem that is unprecedented in human history,” said [Bill Butz](#), president of the Population Reference Bureau. Countries have lost people because of wars, disease and natural disasters but never because women stopped having enough children. Japan announced that its population had shrunk in 2005 for the first time, and that it was now the world’s most elderly nation. Italy was second. On average, women must have 2.1 children in their lifetimes for a society to replenish itself, accounting for infant mortality and other factors. Only one country in Europe — Muslim Albania — has a fertility rate above 2. Russia’s fertility rate is 1.28.

Writer Spengler in the [Asia Times Online](#) commented that demography is destiny: “Never in recorded history have prosperous and peaceful nations chosen to disappear from the face of the earth. Yet that is what the Europeans have chosen to do. Back in 1348 Europe suffered the Black Death....The plague reduced the estimated European population by about a third. In the next 50 years, Europe’s population will relive — in slow motion — that plague demography, losing about a fifth of its population by 2050.”

Historian [Niall Ferguson](#) reveals how Islam is winning the numbers game. “If fertility persisted at such low levels, within 50 years Spain’s population would decline by 3-4 million, Italy’s by a fifth. Not even two World Wars had inflicted such an absolute decline in population.” “In 1950 there had been three times as many people in Britain as in Iran. By 1995 the population of Iran had overtaken that of Britain. By 2050, the population of Iran could be more than 50 per cent larger. At the time of writing, the annual rate of population growth is more than seven times higher in Iran than in Britain.”

We thus have a situation with an explosive population growth in failed countries, while many of the most economically and technologically advanced nations, Eastern and Western, have stagnating populations. This strange and possibly unprecedented situation, which could perhaps be labelled “survival of the least fit”, will have dramatic consequences for the world. It is already producing the largest migration waves in history, threatening to swamp islands of prosperity in a sea of poverty.

Lenin stated that “Marxism is based on internationalism or it is nothing.” “The emancipation of the workers is not a local, nor a national, but an international problem,” wrote Marx. Karl Marx has defined the essence of Socialism as abolishing private property. Let’s assume for a moment that a country can be treated as the

“property” of its citizens. Its inhabitants are responsible for creating its infrastructure. They have built its roads and communications, its schools, universities and medical facilities. They have created its political institutions and instilled in its people the mental capacities needed for upholding them. Is it then wrong for the citizens of this country to want to enjoy the benefits of what they have themselves created?

According to Marxist logic, yes.

Imagine you have two such houses next to each other. In House A, the inhabitants have over a period of generations created a tidy and functioning household. They have limited their number of children because they wanted to give all of them a proper education. In House B, the inhabitants live in a dysfunctional household with too many children who have received little higher education. One day they decide to move to their neighbors'. Many of the inhabitants of House A are protesting, but some of them think this might be a good idea. There is room for more people in House A, they say. In addition to this, Amnesty International, the United Nations and others claim that it is “racist” and “against international law” for the inhabitants of House A to expel the intruders. Pretty soon, House A has been turned into an overpopulated and dysfunctional household just like House B.

This is what is happening to the West today. Europe could become a failed continent itself, importing the problems of Africa and the Islamic world. The notion that everybody should be free to move anywhere they want to, and that preventing them from moving into your home is “racism, xenophobia and bigotry,” is the Communism of the 21st century. And it will probably have the same effect, only on an even large scale.

Communism creates poverty because when people don't own property, they cannot plan for the future. If you and your children cannot enjoy the fruits of your efforts and work, but have to watch others take it away, you will no longer bother to go the extra mile or mobilize your full creativity to generate improvements.

Unrestricted immigration from failed states will eventually destroy global centres of excellence, the same way Communism did. This is definitely bad for the people who will lose what were once functioning countries, but in the long run bad for everybody else, too. It will deprive the inhabitants of Third World countries of the incentives needed to change their own nations if they can simply move somewhere else and refrain from confronting the reasons for their failures.

Many pro-immigrationists use slogans such as “No human is illegal” to argue that immigrants who have entered a country illegally should be allowed to stay. But countries which don't differentiate between citizens and non-citizens cannot long survive. A favorite quotation in the US is from the poem *The New Colossus* by Emma Lazarus; a sonnet written in 1883 that is now engraved on a wall in the base of the Statue of Liberty:

“Give me your tired, your poor, Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free, The wretched refuse of your teeming shore. Send these, the homeless, tempest-tost to me, I lift my lamp beside the golden door!”

It's a great poem, but it's just that, a poem. The global population today is 6.5 billion, and will rise to 8, 9 or even 10 billion in the near future. The “poor and wretched” of the earth make up literally billions of people. Should they all move to the USA? How many people can Americans take in before their country falls apart?

The mantra that “diversity is enriching” does not have any real basis in facts. There are more than 20 member countries in the Arab League. Does “cultural diversity” increase globally if, say, Denmark becomes Arabized due to immigration? You would then get just another Arab country, while the only Denmark in existence would be erased. If “cultural diversity” is our yardstick, today's Muslim immigration to Europe is a disaster. We are replacing unique cultures developed over centuries with burkas and sharia.

Moreover, many politicians and intellectuals fail to appreciate just how much communication technology has changed the rules of the game. When people praise immigration that took place a hundred or two hundred years ago, they are talking about a world that no longer exists, like generals planning for the last war. Modern technology means that immigrants can live in Western countries as if they never left home, visit their original homeland frequently, watch satellite TV in the language of their parents instead of the language of their adopted country, and stay in touch with their relatives back home through the Internet.

Globalization has made it easier than ever not just to move physically to the other side of the world, but also to

live one place physically and on the other side of the world mentally. The full implications of this technological revolution are too complicated to be properly predicted or understood by any one individual, but they are bound to have far-reaching and sometimes unsettling consequences for the nations involved, especially if combined with a deliberate, open-border ideology.

Observer Mac Johnson points out that in the past, admission into the USA was regarded as a very rare and generous gift. Today, admission into the US or any Western democracy “is regarded by many as something between a civil right and an entitlement. Indeed, many seem to believe that the host population should be grateful to them for having arrived. Many immigrants, therefore, arrive as colonists, wishing only to set up a slightly wealthier version of their homeland.” He also points out that until the mid-20th Century, immigration to America occurred from a very restricted pool of nations. “For all our celebration of the great melting pot, America was mostly melting European peoples in that pot. These peoples shared a great deal of cultural inheritance before ever setting foot in America.”

Besides, it is not clear whether experiences from the USA, Canada or Australia can easily be transferred to Europe. The colonization of and immigration to these countries was indeed violent and unacceptable by today’s moral standards. To put it in a brutal way: A country can only become a “successful immigration society” if the indigenous population has been marginalized. In the USA today, only about 3% (the number is disputed) of the population is made up of Native Americans; the rest are all descendants of immigrants.

British commentator Anthony Browne, author of the book “Do We Need Mass Immigration?,” points out that the migration waves we are witnessing now are unique. “What is happening now is the result of sustained migration pressure the likes of which the world has never seen before....The revolution in ‘human rights’ means that as soon as anyone gets past passport control they are pretty much guaranteed to stay. 47,000 illegal immigrants were detected in 2000, but just 6,000 were sent home....A hundred years ago, most people in the west rarely moved even to the next village; now whole villages from Bangladesh are relocating to northern England.”

He quotes the then president of Bangladesh, Sheikh Hasina, who in 2000 was asked by the Los Angeles Times how the country was going to feed, clothe, house and employ the expected doubling of her population by 2050. She replied: “We’ll send them to America. Globalisation will take that problem away, as you free up all factors of production, also labour. There’ll be free movement, country to country. Globalisation in its purest form should not have any boundaries, so small countries with big populations should be able to send population to countries with big boundaries and small populations.”

Browne confronts the assertion that “mass immigration is normal, irreversible and beneficial to host societies” as a “damaging illusion. Rather, the current experience of developed western countries, faced with huge inflows of people...is unprecedented and damaging. The process can and should be stopped, in the interests of the rich diversity of nations it will otherwise crush....In 1924, the US government passed legislation that effectively closed the door on European immigration, opening the door to immigration from poor countries with new legislation only in 1965. Australia has shown in recent years that tough policies can reduce illegal immigration to virtually zero....Pro-immigration campaigners who tell the people of Europe that ‘mass immigration cannot be stopped’ are adopting the policies of despots through history of quelling opposition by telling opponents that resistance is futile. All that is needed is political will.”

American military historian and columnist Victor Davis Hanson talks about how mass immigration is the product of a de facto alliance between the Libertarian Right and the Multicultural Left. The economic Libertarians can be represented by Swedish writer Johan Norberg, author of the book *In Defence of Global Capitalism*. Norberg can have valuable insights into the flaws of the Scandinavian welfare state model. However, his commitment to a “free market, open border” ideology blinds him to the threat posed by Muslim immigration, an ideological blind spot that is almost as big as the ones we find in Marxists. According to him, “at the moment there is a problem. The right supports one part of globalisation — the free movement of capital and goods — while the left tends to support another part, the free movement of people.”

Norberg believes immigration is already so extensive it would be unwise to halt it. Pointing out there were 15 million Muslims in Europe, he noted in a 2003 article: “If we close the borders, if we alienate this substantial minority, we risk creating resentment between ethnic and religious groups, and only the fundamentalists would gain....If people were allowed to cross borders at will, they would take their ideas and their labour and

skills with them. This is all part of free trade, and it's a paradox that many liberals don't see this."

Japan has a declining and ageing population, Yemen and Pakistan have booming populations. Does anybody seriously believe that it would be "good" for the Japanese to open their doors to millions of Muslims from Yemen? "Do you have any education?" "Yes, I know the Koran by heart and can say 'Death to the infidels!' in ten different ways." "Splendid, just what we need here in Japan. Can you start tomorrow on developing a new line of plasma TV screens for SONY?"

When it comes to stagnating populations and Muslim immigration, the problems are not nearly as damaging as the cure.

Ethnically homogeneous nations enjoy a "trust bonus" which reduces the amount of conflict. There is little evidence that any theoretical "diversity" bonus from immigration will cancel out the loss of this "trust bonus." South Korea and Japan are among the world leaders in technology. They are both ethnically homogeneous nations. Even China, which does have significant ethnic minorities, could soon be more ethnically homogeneous than many so-called Western nations. There will be no lack of "diversity" in the 21st century, but there could be a lack of functioning, coherent nation states. Maybe the West will "celebrate diversity" until our countries fall apart, and global leadership will be transferred to East Asia.

Yes, it is true that the ability to attract ambitious and talented scientists from other countries has benefited the USA in the past, and given it an edge over Europe. However, it is not without dangers to "celebrate diversity" in a country as diverse as the US. Americans should try celebrating what binds them together instead, or they may wake up one day and discover that they don't really have a lot in common. What then for the United States?

Anthony Browne notes that Britain "became the largest economic power in the world in the nineteenth century, in the almost complete absence of immigration to these isles. Japan became the world's second largest economy after the second world war in the almost total absence of immigration. Britain can never compete on the basis of low wages with low cost countries such as China for the simple reason that the cost of living is so much higher, and it is a mistake to try. Although cheap labour immigration may have staved off the demise of those industries for a short while, it also compromised them by encouraging them to go down the cheap labour route, and discouraging them from going up the high productivity/value added route."

The revered former Chairman of the US Federal Reserve, Alan Greenspan, stated in a testimony given to the U.S. Senate: "Although discovery of new technologies is to some degree a matter of luck, we know that human activities do respond to economic incentives. A relative shortage of workers should increase the incentives for developing labor-saving technologies and may actually spur technological development."

Robert Rowthorn, academic economist, criticizes the claim, frequently repeated by Tony Blair's Labour government since it took office in 1997, that "if we don't have immigration, we won't have economic growth." According to Rowthorn, "if you repeat something often enough, you can perhaps make people believe it." There is no evidence "that large-scale immigration generates large-scale economic benefits for the existing population as a whole. On the contrary, all the research suggests that the benefits are either close to zero, or negative" as unskilled migrants and their families often are net consumers of taxes.

"Immigration can't solve the pensions crisis, nor solve the problem of an ageing population, as its advocates so often claim. It can, at most, delay the day of reckoning, because, of course, immigrants themselves grow old, and they need pensions....The injection of large numbers of unskilled workers into the economy does not benefit the bulk of the population to any great extent. It benefits the nanny-and housecleaner-using classes; it benefits employers who want to pay low wages; but it does not benefit indigenous, unskilled Britons. While Britain has always had immigration, the recent influx is totally without precedent in modern times."

Rowthorn also points out, correctly, that "refugees and others granted special leave to remain under the asylum rules account for only 10 per cent of immigration to Britain. Most permanent immigration consists of people who are economic migrants together with their dependants." Most of them aren't people fleeing persecution.

People smuggling has become one of the world's biggest and most lucrative businesses, with professional



smugglers who demand high payments. In one case in Norway, a boy around eight years old said his mother and siblings in Kosovo were dead. An investigation into his case, however, found his parents and siblings living in Greece. Fully 94 percent of would-be refugees arriving in Norway lack valid identification papers. In the last four years, 50% of those who have been refused asylum in Sweden have gone underground and have simply vanished. And of the half who have actually been sent home, a full 20% have come straight back to Sweden to try their luck again.

In Iran, the Committee for the Commemoration of Martyrs of the Global Islamic Campaign bragged that it was targeting potential suicide bombers in Britain because of the relative ease with which UK passport-holders could enter Israel. “Do you think getting hold of a British passport for an Iranian citizen is hard? Tens of passports are issued for Iranian asylum seekers in Britain every day. There are hundreds of other ways available to us, such as illegal entry [into Britain], fake passports, etc.” One gang is estimated to have smuggled 100,000 illegal immigrants, mainly Turkish Kurds, into Britain. These economic migrants paid between £3,000 and £5,000 to be transported via an elaborate and dangerous route.

“We were just tired of living in the forest,” explained a young man from Guinea-Bissau. “There was nothing to eat, there was nothing to drink.” In mid-September, Africans began assaulting the frontier of Spain’s small enclaves in Africa en masse. Deploying crude ladders made of branches, they used their weight to bring the fences down in places. As one of them put it, “We go in a group and all jump at once. We know that some will get through, that others will be injured and others may die, but we have to get through, whatever the cost.”

Rickard Sandell of the Royal Elcano Institute in Madrid predicted that the migration now underway could signal the prospect of an African “mass exodus” and armed conflict. What one sees today “is only the beginning of an immigration phenomenon that could evolve into one of the largest in history... the mass assault on Spain’s African border may just be a first warning of what to expect of the future.” With its shores only about 20 kilometers (12 miles) from the African coast, Spain is in the frontline of the fight against illegal immigration.

José Zapatero, Spain’s Prime Minister, said during a visit to the Canary Islands that his country would “spare no resources” to curb illegal immigration from Africa. However, his Socialist government launched an amnesty for more than 600,000 illegal immigrants the year before, thus greatly encouraging more illegal immigration. Moreover, due to the borderless nature of modern Europe caused by the European Union, once you get into Spain or any other EU country, you are free to move on to others.

The so-called Schengen Agreement, signed by a total of 26 countries, means that border posts and checks have been removed between European countries and common external border controls established. These are not always working very well. Since the pre-political loyalty, as Roger Scruton would have called it, for most people in Europe is with their nation states and not with “Europe,” not all countries care too much about upholding the borders of other nations. There have been reports of Italian police, for instance, releasing illegal immigrants on the border, free to go further north. Not their country, not their problem.

At the time of the greatest population explosion in the history of the human race on its mainly Muslim southern borders, and when half of all Arab youths express a desire to move to the West, European authorities decide that it’s a brilliant idea to remove as many border controls as possible. And EU bureaucrats are quietly working to extend the “four freedoms of the EU,” including the free movement of people between countries, to include the Arab world.

Just like a scene from *The Camp of the Saints*, the controversial book by Jean Raspail, thousands of African immigrants have come ashore the Mediterranean island of Malta the past four years, most often making the crossing from Libya in open fishing boats, heading for the European mainland. And the tiny island of Malta feels overwhelmed. “We don’t want a multicultural society,” said Martin Degiorgio, a leader of an anti-immigration group. “Haven’t you seen the problems it has brought to France and Britain?” Scicluna, the government adviser, said that it was “utterly unrealistic to think you can pull up the drawbridge” and that the country needed time to adjust to immigration. “We’ve got to live with it. We’ve got to adapt to it. We have got to make it work,” he said.

Massive movements of people have in the past almost always triggered wars. There is little reason to expect our countries to be an exception. Nearly 200 million people in 2006 lived outside their country of origin. That



is a number similar to the entire planet's population during what we in European history call the Migration Period, which triggered the downfall of the Roman Empire in the 4th and 5th centuries. The similarities have not gone unnoticed by everybody.

Rear Admiral Chris Parry, one of Britain's most senior military strategists, has warned that Western civilization faces a threat on a par with the barbarian invasions that destroyed the Roman Empire. "Globalisation makes assimilation seem redundant and old-fashioned... [the process] acts as a sort of reverse colonisation, where groups of people are self-contained, going back and forth between their countries, exploiting sophisticated networks and using instant communication on phones and the internet." Third World instability could lick at the edges of the West as pirates attack holidaymakers from fast boats. "At some time in the next 10 years it may not be safe to sail a yacht between Gibraltar and Malta." The effects will be magnified as borders become more porous and some areas sink beyond effective government control. Parry expected the world population to grow to about 8.4 billion in 2035, with some giant metropolises becoming ungovernable. The subsequent mass population movements, Parry argued, could lead to the "Rome scenario."

The waves of migration that the Western world is faced with now are far, far greater in scope and speed than those which brought down the Roman Empire. At least 2.2 million migrants will arrive in the West every year until 2050, according to a United Nations report from 2007. The world's population could reach an estimated 9.2 billion by the middle of this century.

It is striking that it appears to be taken for granted by the UN that we will sit back, bleed to death and accept all these millions flooding our countries. It is presented like a natural disaster, as if the massive population growth cannot be stopped by the nations in question or the ensuing migration cannot be limited by Western countries. Both assumptions are wrong. Westerners cannot and should not take responsibility for billions of people in other parts of the world. They will have to limit their population growth to a sustainable level. We have already accepted more immigration than any society has done peacefully in human history.

Many people watch with resigned fatalism — a fatalism which used to be alien to Western culture — as we are told by our leaders and media that this is "inevitable." But nothing is inevitable. Our societies will collapse if this continues, yet we are supposed to be quiet bystanders to our own demise. Right-wingers tell us that it will be "good for the economy," and left-wingers attack us for "racism" if we desire our own continued existence. As blog reader An Indian Living in the West writes:

"They say that all 'rich nations' will face mass immigration. But, Japan, Taiwan, South Korea, Singapore and even Malaysia are also rich nations. Immigration to those countries is close to zero. I think that immigration is matter of government policy and national will. If the will is there, you can have zero immigration or limited immigration. But there isn't the will to do anything about immigration in the West. Instead they sit and wring their hands....If there was ever a picture of a society that has been completely finished, this is it. You don't have to discriminate on racial grounds or religious grounds, just reduce the annual quota to 1000 or 10000. Nothing illiberal about that. But they cannot contemplate even that! Westerners amuse me. Even the worst cowards in the so-called 'third world' have more spine than this."

He is right: The West does seem to have lost its willpower, and certain groups deliberately want to dismantle existing nation states.

The Danish writer Carsten Ringsmose was a speaker at a conference at the University of Odense on the immigration-related topic of "Recognition and integration." He outlined the projected population growth for the Islamic world, and stated that if recent prognoses are correct, the Islamic world will witness a population growth more than the equivalent of all EU member countries combined within just a few decades. One of the other speakers suggested that this population boom could be solved through migration to the West, which would mean that Denmark, with a present population of 5.4 million inhabitants, would have to accept perhaps 9.5 million predominantly Muslim immigrants within two generations. The man who suggested this, accompanied by segments of the audience, laughed when Mr. Ringsmose suggested that this simply wasn't doable.

The German professor of sociology Gunnar Heinsohn worries about what he calls the "demographic capitulation" of European nations. He fears that their imploding birth rates will lead to the collapse of the welfare state, and that immigration cannot solve this problem. He does not believe that material aid to

countries with large youth populations will prevent wars and terror. On the contrary, it may in fact increase unrest and violence. Over the course of five generations (1900-2000), the population in predominantly Muslim countries has grown from 150 million to 1200 million. He notes that Western countries are funding the Palestinian population explosion, among others, and argues that this must stop. He believes the West should stay out of the affairs of Muslim countries with expanding populations as much as possible, and only interfere briefly if they threaten us directly.

In June 2007, British Prime Minister Tony Blair, along with Chancellor (and PM-in-waiting) Gordon Brown and Conservative Party leader David Cameron, met Muslim leaders at a conference organized by The Cambridge Inter-Faith Programme. Blair opened the conference by defending Islam as a religion of “moderation and modernity” as he announced a £1M government fund to aid teaching of the religion and train imams, and designated Islamic studies as “strategically important” to the British national interest. Timothy Winter, lecturer in Islamic Studies at Cambridge, said: “The question facing British society, and society as a whole, is not how we encourage minorities to engage with western countries, but how those countries define themselves as a collage of different religious cultures.”

In other words: Britain, Germany, France and other Western countries with white majorities are no longer nations with a distinct heritage, only random spaces on the map with a “collage of different cultures.”

Westerners are the suckers of the 21st century. The rest of the world is entitled to preserve itself. We, on the other hand, are not. We don’t have interests of our own. We exist solely as a vehicle for funding other nations, and as the obedient dumping ground for their excess population growth. If we assert the right to defend our borders, representatives of left-leaning non-governmental organizations, NGOs aided by our so-called leaders, will come down upon us like a ton of bricks. Westerners are funding the unsustainable growth rates in the developing world through material aid and medical advances. Later we are told to let them into our countries, where we will continue funding our own colonization and eventual eradication through welfare payments. We are paying others to multiply and conquer our lands. This policy is insane and evil, and it has to stop.

In the middle of the massive waves of migration in the 21st century it is suicidal to cling on to ideas of a “borderless world.” Yet in the West, there seems to be an alliance between the anti-national forces of the political Left and the Libertarian ideals and short-term desire for cheap labor of the political Right, who denounce their critics as “racists.” Perhaps we can call it an Alliance of Utopias. What these Western Utopians don’t understand is that there is another, competing Utopia of a borderless world: The Islamic Caliphate. As long as the Islamic world can dump their excess population in infidel countries and Muslims make up a majority — some say 70% — of the world’s refugees, any policies of not maintaining our borders will only pave the way for the Islamization of our lands. And it will happen with the blessing of many of our intellectuals, both right-wing and left-wing.

A plague on both their houses.

## Fourteen Centuries of War against European Civilization

*The following essay is an amalgam of my previous online essays, among them [Who Are We, Who Are Our Enemies — The Cost of Historical Amnesia, Why We Should Oppose an Independent Kosovo, Refuting God's Crucible](#) and [The Truth About Islam in Europe](#). After publishing it, I see that I should probably have called it “Fourteen Centuries of War against Civilization,” since Islamic Jihad targets any civilization worthy of the name, Eastern or Western. But the primary focus of this book is Europe, and so will the focus of this essay be.*

*“The Jihad, the Islamic so-called Holy War, has been a fact of life in Europe, Asia, Africa and the Near and Middle East for more than 1300 years, but this is the first history of the Muslim wars in Europe ever to be published. Hundreds of books, however, have appeared on its Christian counterpart, the Crusades, to which the Jihad is often compared, although they lasted less than two hundred years and unlike the Jihad, which is universal, were largely but not completely confined to the Holy Land. Moreover, the Crusades have been over for more than 700 years, while a Jihad is still going on in the world. The Jihad has been the most unrecorded and disregarded major event of history. It has, in fact, been largely ignored. For instance, the Encyclopaedia Britannica gives the Crusades eighty times more space than the Jihad.”*

The above quote is from Paul Fregosi's book [Jihad in the West](#) from 1998. Mr. Fregosi found that his book about the history of Islamic Holy War in Europe from the 7th to the 20th centuries was difficult to get published in the mid-1990s, when publishers had the Salman Rushdie case in fresh memory.

A few years later, perhaps the most comprehensive and scholarly book on the subject to date, [The Legacy of Jihad](#), was published by Andrew G. Bostom. He has written about what he calls “[America's First War on Terror](#).” Thomas Jefferson and John Adams, then serving as American ambassadors to France and Britain, respectively, met in 1786 in London with the Tripolitan Ambassador to Britain, Sidi Haji Abdul Rahman Adja. These future American presidents were attempting to negotiate a peace treaty which would spare the United States the ravages of Jihad piracy — murder and enslavement emanating from the so-called Barbary States of North Africa, corresponding to modern Morocco, Algeria, Tunisia, and Libya.

Bostom notes that “an aggressive jihad was *already* being waged against the United States almost 200 years prior to America becoming a dominant international power in the Middle East.” Israel has nothing to do with it. The Barbary Jihad piracy had been going on since the earliest Arab-Islamic expansion in the 7th and 8th centuries. Francisco Gabrieli states that:

According to present-day concepts of international relations, such activities amounted to piracy, but they correspond perfectly to jihad, an Islamic religious duty. The conquest of Crete, in the east, and a good portion of the corsair warfare along the Provencal and Italian coasts, in the West, are among the most conspicuous instances of such “private initiative” which contributed to Arab domination in the Mediterranean.

A proto-typical Muslim naval razzia occurred in 846 when a fleet of Arab Jihadists arrived at the mouth of the Tiber, made their way to Rome, sacked the city, and carried away from the basilica of St. Peter all of the gold and silver it contained. The creation of the Vatican as a walled “city within a city” was in response to the recurrent threat of Islamic Jihad raids.

Bostom notes that “By June/July 1815 the ably commanded U.S. naval forces had dealt their Barbary jihadist adversaries a quick series of crushing defeats. This success ignited the imagination of the Old World powers to rise up against the Barbary pirates.”

Yet some Arabs seem to miss the good old days when they could extract jizya payments from the West. Libyan terrorist-sponsoring leader Muammar Gaddafi has stated that he thinks that European nations should pay 10 billion euros (\$12.7 billion dollars) a year to Africa to help it stop migrants seeking a better life flooding northwards into Europe. He added without elaborating: “Earth belongs to everybody. Why they (young Africans) emigrated to Europe — this should be answered by Europeans.” Apart from being a clear-cut example of how migration, or rather population dumping, has become a tool for blackmail in the 21st century, this is a throwback to the age when Tripoli could extract payments from Europe.

[Robert Davis](#), professor of history at Ohio State University, developed new methodical enumeration in his

book Christian Slaves, Muslim Masters which indicates that perhaps one and one-quarter *million* white European Christians were enslaved by Barbary Muslims just from 1530 through 1780 — a far greater number than had been estimated before:

“Enslavement was a very real possibility for anyone who traveled in the Mediterranean, or who lived along the shores in places like Italy, France, Spain and Portugal, and even as far north as England and Iceland. Much of what has been written gives the impression that there were not many slaves and minimizes the impact that slavery had on Europe,” Davis said. “Most accounts only look at slavery in one place, or only for a short period of time. But when you take a broader, longer view, the massive scope of this slavery and its powerful impact become clear.”

Corsairs from cities in North Africa — Tunis, Algiers etc. — would raid ships in the Mediterranean and Atlantic, as well as seaside villages to capture men, women and children. The impact was devastating — France, England, and Spain each lost thousands of ships, and long stretches of the Spanish and Italian coasts were almost completely abandoned by their inhabitants.

At its peak, the destruction and depopulation of some areas probably exceeded what European slavers would later inflict on the African interior. The lives of European slaves were often no better than the victims of the transatlantic slave trade, which tapped into the pre-established Islamic slave-trade in Africa. “As far as daily living conditions, the Mediterranean slaves certainly didn’t have it better,” Davis says. While African slaves did grueling labor on sugar and cotton plantations in the Americas, European slaves were often worked just as hard and as lethally — in quarries, in heavy construction, and above all rowing the corsair galleys.

Throughout most of the seventeenth century, the English alone lost at least 400 sailors a year to the slavers. One American slave reported that 130 American seamen had been enslaved by the Algerians in the Mediterranean and Atlantic just between 1785 and 1793 (which prompted the later military response from the Americans). In his book White Gold, Giles Milton describes how regular Jihad razzias in Europe extended as far north as Iceland. Even during the time of Queen Elizabeth I, while William Shakespeare was writing his plays and poems, young Englishmen risked being surprised by a fleet of Muslim pirates showing up at their village, or being kidnapped while fishing at sea:

“By the end of the dreadful summer of 1625, the mayor of Plymouth reckoned that 1,000 skiffs had been destroyed, and a similar number of villagers carried off into slavery.” Such events took place across much of Europe, also in Wales and southern Ireland: “In 1631...200 Islamic soldiers...sailed to the village of Baltimore, storming ashore with swords drawn and catching the villagers totally by surprise. (They) carried off 237 men, women, and children and took them to Algiers...The French padre Pierre Dan was in the city (Algiers) at the time...He witnessed the sale of the captives in the slave auction. ‘It was a pitiful sight to see them exposed in the market...Women were separated from their husbands and the children from their fathers...on one side a husband was sold; on the other his wife; and her daughter was torn from her arms without the hope that they’d ever see each other again’.”

The Englishman Thomas Pellow was enslaved in Morocco for twenty-three years after being captured by Barbary pirates as a cabin boy on a small English vessel in 1716. He was tortured until he accepted Islam. For weeks he was beaten and starved, and finally gave in after his torturer resorted to “burning my flesh off my bones by fire, which the tyrant did, by frequent repetitions, after a most cruel manner.”

God’s Crucible: Islam and the Making of Europe, 570-1215 was written by David Levering Lewis, the American historian and two-time winner of the prestigious Pulitzer Prize. He states that Muslims did not enslave their co-religionists, only infidels. Yes, but why is that better?

As Robert Spencer writes in his book *Religion of Peace?*:

“The Qur’an says that the followers of Muhammad are ‘ruthless to the unbelievers but merciful to one another’ (48:29), and that the unbelievers are the ‘worst of created beings’ (98:6). One may exercise the Golden Rule in relation to a fellow Muslim, but according to the laws of Islam, the same courtesy is not to be extended to unbelievers. That is one principal reason why the primary source of slaves in the Islamic world has been non-Muslims, whether Jews, Christians, Hindus, or pagans. Most slaves were non-Muslims who had been captured during jihad warfare.”



Slavery was taken for granted throughout Islamic history. When it was finally abolished this was due to Western pressure, especially the efforts of the British Empire. Spencer again:

“Nor was there a Muslim abolitionist movement, no Clarkson, Wilberforce, or Garrison. When the slave trade ended, it was ended not through Muslim efforts but through British military force. Even so, there is evidence that slavery continues beneath the surface in some Muslim countries — notably Saudi Arabia, which only abolished slavery in 1962; Yemen and Oman, both of which ended legal slavery in 1970; and Niger, which didn’t abolish slavery until 2004. In Niger, the ban is widely ignored, and as many as one million people remain in bondage. Slaves are bred, often raped, and generally treated like animals. There are even slavery cases involving Muslims in the United States. A Saudi named Homaidan al-Turki was sentenced in September 2006 to twenty-seven years to life in prison for keeping a woman as a slave in his Colorado home. For his part, al-Turki claimed that he was a victim of anti-Muslim bias.”

Jihad slavery was widespread in Africa and in many regions of Asia. Indian historian K. S. Lal states that wherever Jihadists conquered a territory, “there developed a system of slavery peculiar to the clime, terrain, and populace of the place.” When Muslim armies invaded India, “its people began to be enslaved in droves to be sold in foreign lands or employed in various capacities on menial and not-so-meneial jobs within the country.”

Briefly summed up, *God’s Crucible* laments the fact that Charles Martel, “the Hammer,” halted the advancing Islamic Jihad at the Battle of Tours or, Battle of Poitiers, in 732:

“Had ‘Abd al-Rahman’s men prevailed that October day, the post-Roman Occident would probably have been incorporated into a cosmopolitan, Muslim *regnum* unobstructed by borders, as they hypothesize — one devoid of a priestly caste, animated by the dogma of equality of the faithful, and respectful of all religious faiths. Curiously, such speculation has a French pedigree. Forty years ago, two historians, Jean-Henri Roy and Jean Deviosse enumerated the benefits of a Muslim triumph at Poitiers: astronomy; trigonometry; Arabic numerals; the corpus of Greek philosophy. ‘We [Europe] would have gained 267 years,’ according to their calculations. ‘We might have been spared the wars of religion.’ To press the logic of this disconcerting analysis, the victory of Charles the Hammer must be seen as greatly contributing to the creation of an economically retarded, balkanized, fratricidal Europe that, in defining itself in opposition to Islam, made virtues out of religious persecution, cultural particularism, and hereditary aristocracy.”

David Levering Lewis is clearly sympathetic towards this view, and writes that the Carolingian order, established Charles Martel (*Carolus* in Latin) and his grandson Charlemagne, was “religiously intolerant, intellectually impoverished, socially calcified, and economically primitive.” Curiously, he mentions in passing that there was continuous “out-migration to the Christian kingdoms” from al-Andalus. Why did they move to the Christian lands, whose economy was “little better than late Neolithic,” if life was so sweet in al-Andalus? Lewis states that: “At the end of the eighth century, Europe was militarily strong enough to defend itself from Islam, thanks in part to Charlemagne and his predecessors. The question was whether it was politically, economically, and culturally better off for being able to do so.”

*God’s Crucible* was published during a time when Spain and Portugal under Islamic occupation are being hailed as a model of coexistence with Islam. The European Union recently announced its intentions of expanding to include the Muslim Middle East and North Africa. There is a concerted effort going on to present Islam as something non-threatening, indeed benevolent. In May 2008, Germany’s *Der Spiegel*, Europe’s largest weekly magazine, hailed al-Andalus as a “[Multicultural model](#)” for Europe:

“For nearly 800 years, the inhabitants of al-Andalus, as the Arab dynasties called their empire on the Iberian Peninsula, allowed Jews, Christians and Muslims to coexist in a spirit of mutual respect — a situation that benefited all.” Never mind that Richard Fletcher states in his book [Moorish Spain](#) that “Moorish Spain was not a tolerant and enlightened society even in its most cultivated epoch.”

The European Union, the Council of Europe and numerous Islamic organizations are working hard to rewrite European school textbooks in order to promote Islam. In the European Parliament, the German Christian Democrat [Hans-Gert Pöttering](#) has stated that textbooks should be reviewed for intolerant depictions of Islam to ensure that they don’t propagate “prejudice.” He suggested that the EU should co-operate with the



Organization of the Islamic Conference to create a textbook review committee. The OIC desires to rewrite textbooks around the world to remove anything critical of Islam, silence mentioning of the victims of 1400 years of Islamic Jihad and glorify the achievements of “Islamic civilization.”

Robert Spencer writes in Religion of Peace?: Why Christianity Is and Islam Isn't:

“Islamic apologist Karen Armstrong enunciates the common wisdom when she says that ‘until 1492, Jews and Christians lived peaceably and productively together in Muslim Spain — a coexistence that was impossible elsewhere in Europe.’ Even the U.S. State Department has proclaimed that ‘during the Islamic period in Spain, Jews, Christians, and Muslims lived together in peace and mutual respect, creating a diverse society in which vibrant exchanges of ideas took place.’”

Those who want a second opinion can start with reading the online essay Andalusian Myth, Eurabian Reality by Bat Ye'or and Andrew G. Bostom:

“There were rarely periods of peace in the Amirate of Cordova (756-912), nor later. Al-Andalus represented the land of jihad par excellence. Every year, sometimes twice a year, raiding expeditions were sent to ravage the Christian Spanish kingdoms to the north, the Basque regions, or France and the Rhone valley, bringing back booty and slaves. Andalusian corsairs attacked and invaded along the Sicilian and Italian coasts, even as far as the Aegean Islands, looting and burning as they went. Thousands of people were deported to slavery in Andalusia, where the caliph kept a militia of tens of thousand of Christian slaves brought from all parts of Christian Europe (the Saqaliba), and a harem filled with captured Christian women.”

David Levering Lewis mentions “a small group of Andalusian Christians” filled with “fanaticism” who engaged in “a senseless spike in religious provocation” where individual Christian priests and laypersons “publicly disrespected mosques, the Qur'an, and the Prophet's name.” Because of this, Cordoba's *qadi* (Islamic judge), poor thing, had no choice. The ruler Muhammad I “approved his *qadi*'s death sentence in 851-52 for thirteen Christians for whom clemency was impolitic if not impossible under Malikite *Sharia*.”

Unfortunately, these “Christian militants,” as Mr. Lewis calls them, were still deaf to all pleas of behaving in a properly submissive manner to Muslims, and more death sentences ensued:

Twenty or so ‘Mozarab martyrs’ were dispatched in 853 or the year following, and a dozen more afterward. In another wave of Christian blasphemy in 859, thirteen more were executed, along with two daughters of a prominent Muslim family living in distant Huesca who defiantly disclosed their secret Christian conversion.

Lewis believes that: “A poll taken of Andalusians of all faiths would have shown an overwhelming disapproval of the ‘Mozarab martyrs.’ These Christian extremists were an aberration not because they acted outside history but because they were premature — three centuries ahead of the history whose intense cultural nationalism and religious intolerance were inculcated in the decades after the Battle of Clavijo.”

The “religious intolerance” he is referring to is not the Jihad waged against Christians and Jews in Spain and Portugal; it is the *Reconquista*, the Christian reconquest of the Iberian Peninsula. It is traditionally seen to have begun with Pelayo in 718. Although initially slow, it speeded up from the eleventh century onwards. The Portuguese had been liberated in 1249 under King Afonso III. The concept “Holy War” was originally alien to Christianity and was imported to Europe only after Europeans had been confronted with centuries of Islamic Jihad.

Lewis himself states (correctly) that people during this “golden age of tolerance” were executed for criticizing Islam. Isn't that disturbing, given that al-Andalus is now supposed to serve as the blueprint for our coexistence with Islam, according to our authorities and media? “Blasphemy” against Islam and Muhammad is punishable by death in sharia law, which is why the Dutch filmmaker Theo van Gogh was murdered by a Muslim in Amsterdam in 2004.

Even for non-Muslims who accept Islamic rule life is harsh, with severe economic strains and the constant threat of violence in the back of your mind. Scholar Bat Ye'or is an expert on *dhimmitude*, the oppressive and humiliating system for non-Muslims under Islamic rule, described in the book Islam and Dhimmitude. She writes this about the Jihad slave system:

“When Amr conquered Tripoli (Libya) in 643, he forced the Jewish and Christian Berbers to give their wives and children as slaves to the Arab army as part of their *jizya*. From 652 until its conquest in 1276, Nubia was forced to send an annual contingent of slaves to Cairo. Treaties concluded with the towns of Transoxiana [Iranian central Asia], Sijistan [eastern Iran], Armenia, and Fezzan (Maghreb) under the Umayyads and Abbasids stipulated an annual dispatch of slaves from both sexes. However, the main sources for the supply of slaves remained the regular raids on villages within the dar-al-harb [non-Islamic regions] and the military expeditions which swept more deeply into the infidel lands, emptying towns and provinces of their inhabitants.”

Sir Jadunath Sarkar, the pre-eminent historian of Mughal India, wrote this about dhimmitude:

“The conversion of the entire population to Islam and the extinction of every form of dissent is the ideal of the Muslim State. If any infidel is suffered to exist in the community, it is as a necessary evil, and for a transitional period only....A non-Muslim therefore cannot be a citizen of the State; he is a member of a depressed class; his status is a modified form of slavery. He lives under a contract (*dhimma*) with the State....In short, his continued existence in the State after the conquest of his country by the Muslims is conditional upon his person and property made subservient to the cause of Islam.”

This “modified form of slavery” is now frequently referred to as the pinnacle of “tolerance.” If the semi-slaves desire equal rights and self-determination, Jihad resumes. This is what happened with the non-Muslim subjects of the Ottoman Empire, starting with the Serbs and the Greeks in the 19th century, and continuing with Bulgarians and others. They were repressed with massacres, culminating in the outright Jihad genocide by Turkish and Kurdish Muslims against Armenians in the early 20th century. The Jews of Israel are not only attacked because they are Jews, but primarily because they are Jews who do not meekly disarm and accept the status of servitude that they should have according to Islamic law. They are disobedient dhimmis, just as the Armenians were.

Living under Islamic rule was a serious burden even at the best of times, also economically with the *jizya* tax. According to Robert Spencer, “Although the strictness with which the laws of dhimmitude (the subservient status of Jews and Christians) were enforced varied, they were never abolished, and during times of relaxation the subject populations always lived in fear that they would be enforced with new stringency. Muslim rulers did not forget that the Qur’an mandates that both Jews and Christians must ‘feel themselves subdued.’ One notable instance is recounted by Arab historian Philip Hitti: ‘The caliph al-Mutawakkil in 850 and 854 decreed that Christians and Jews should affix wooden images of devils to their houses, level their graves even with the ground, wear outer garments of honey color, i.e., yellow, put two honey-colored patches on the clothes of their slaves... and ride only on mules and asses with wooden saddles marked by two pomegranate-like balls on the cantle.’”

In 1888, a Tunisian Jew noted: “The Jew is prohibited in this country to wear the same clothes as a Muslim and may not wear a red tarbush. He can be seen to bow down with his whole body to a Muslim child and permit him the traditional privilege of striking him in the face, a gesture that can prove to be of the gravest consequence. Indeed, the present writer has received such blows. In such matters the offenders act with complete impunity, for this has been the custom from time immemorial.”

Maimonides, the renowned medieval Jewish philosopher and physician who had to flee Islamic-ruled Spain due to an aggressive Jihad, stated that “the Arabs have persecuted us severely, and passed baneful and discriminatory legislation against us... Never did a nation molest, degrade, debase, and hate us as much as they.” Jews could teach rabbinic law to Christians, but Muslims will interpret what they are taught “according to their erroneous principles and they will oppress us. [F]or this reason... they hate all [non-Muslims] who live among them.” Christians “admit that the text of the Torah, such as we have it, is intact.”

What about science and learning? Scholar Toby E. Huff, author of the book [The Rise of Early Modern Science: Islam, China and the West](#), warns that if Islam had taken over Europe, later Western [scientific achievements](#) would have been impossible:

“If Spain had persisted as an Islamic land into the later centuries — say, until the time of Napoleon — it would have retained all the ideological, legal, and institutional defects of Islamic civilization. A Spain dominated by

Islamic law would have been unable to found new universities based on the European model of legally autonomous corporate governance, as corporations do not exist in Islamic law. Furthermore, the Islamic model of education rested on the absolute primacy of *fiqh*, of legal studies, and the standard of preserving the great traditions of the past. This was symbolically reflected in the *ijaza*, the personal authorization to transmit knowledge from the past given by a learned man, a tradition quite different from the West's group-administered certification (through examination) of demonstrated learning. In the actual event, the founding of Spanish universities in the thirteenth century, first in Palencia (1208-9), Valladolid, Salamanca (1227-8), and so on, occurred in long-established Christian areas, and the universities were modeled after the constitutions of Paris and Bologna."

Greek learning was never integrated into the regular curriculum at Islamic schools, as it was in European universities. The German-Syrian writer Bassam Tibi in his book *Islam Between Culture and Politics* points out that "science" in the Islamic *madrasa* meant the study of the Koran, the hadith, Arab history etc.:

"Some Islamic historians wrongly translate the term *madrasa* as university. This is plainly incorrect: If we understand a university as *universitas litterarum*, or consider, without the bias of Eurocentrism, the case of the *universitas magistrorum* of the thirteenth century in Paris, we are bound to recognise that the university as a seat for free and unrestrained enquiry based on reason, is a European innovation in the history of mankind."

According to the leading scholar Edward Grant in Science and Religion, 400 B.C. to A.D. 1550: From Aristotle to Copernicus, Islam is a theocracy in which religion and state form a single entity. There is thus no secular state apparatus distinct from the Islamic religion:

"[Islamic madrasas] had as their primary mission the teaching of the Islamic religion, and paid little attention to the foreign sciences, which, as we saw, were comprised of the science and natural philosophy derived ultimately from the Greeks. The analytical subjects derived from the Greeks certainly did not have equal status with religious and theological subjects. Indeed, the foreign sciences played a rather marginal role in the madrasas, which formed the core of Islamic higher education. Only those subjects that illuminated the Qur'an or the religious law were taught. One such subject was logic, which was found useful not only in semantics but was also regarded as helpful in avoiding simple errors of inference. The primary function of the madrasas, however, was 'to preserve learning and defend orthodoxy' (Mottahedeh 1985, 91). In Islam, most theologians did not regard natural philosophy as a subject helpful to a better understanding of religion. On the contrary, it was usually viewed as a subject capable of subverting the Islamic religion and, therefore, as potentially dangerous to the faith. Natural philosophy always remained a peripheral discipline in the lands of Islam and was never institutionalized within the educational system, as it was in Latin Christendom."

Fear and uncertainty afflicted all too many Islamic natural philosophers. As Grant states, "Without the separation of church and state, and the developments that proceeded as a consequence, the West would not have produced a deeply rooted natural philosophy that was disseminated through Europe by virtue of an extensive network of universities, which laid the foundation for the great scientific advances made in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, advances that have continued to the present day."

Jihad continues to this day in the Balkans, a region which was for centuries under brutal Turkish rule. According to writer Ruth King, "When Serbia became independent of Byzantine rule in the 12th century, its economic, cultural, social and religious institutions were among the most advanced in Europe. Serbia functioned as a bridge between Greco-Byzantine civilization and the developing Western Renaissance. The center of the Serbian Orthodox Church was in Kosovo where churches, monasteries and monastic communities were established. A form of census in 1330, the 'Decani Charter,' detailed the list of chartered villages and households, of which only two percent were Albanian. The Ottomans invaded Serbia in 1389 and consolidated their rule in 1459, propelling major parts of the Balkan peninsula and adjacent southeast Europe into a Koran-dictated Dark Ages."

Early in the twentieth century Serbian Christians comprised roughly two-thirds of the population of Kosovo. After WW2, Communist dictator Tito did not allow Serbs who fled from their homes to return and did not enforce border controls as thousands of Albanians moved into Kosovo. This later led to escalating violence against Christian Serbs.

As King says, “Initially, the media reported the situation in Kosovo fairly. For example, in July 1982 The New York Times noted: ‘Serbs have been harassed by Albanians and have packed up and left the region. The Albanian nationalists have a two-point platform, first to establish what they call an ethnically clean Albanian republic and then to merge with Albania for a greater Albania. Some 57,000 Serbs have left Kosovo in the last decade.’ Five years later, in 1987, the Times was still reporting the persecution of Serbs within Kosovo. ‘Slavic Orthodox churches have been attacked, wells poisoned, crops burned, Slavic boys knifed. Young Albanians have been told to rape Serbian girls... Officials in Belgrade view the ethnic Albanian challenge as imperiling the foundations of the multinational experiment called federal Yugoslavia... Ethnic Albanians already control almost every phase of life in the autonomous province of Kosovo, including the police, judiciary, civil service, schools, and factories.’”

It was this situation that led to the rise of Serb nationalist leader Slobodan Milosevic. However, according to Ruth King, “While the brutality of the Milosevic regime was indeed a complicating factor, he is long gone, but the KLA [Kosovo Liberation Army] continues its assault on Serbs, on their churches, priests, homes, even on civilians sitting in cafes, this under the nose of the U.S. and UN troops.”

Bosnia’s wartime president Alija Izetbegovic died in 2003, hailed as a moderate Muslim leader. Little was said in Western media about his 1970 Islamic Declaration, where he advocated “a struggle for creating a great Islamic federation from Morocco to Indonesia, from the tropical Africa to the Central Asia,” and that “The Islamic movement should and must start taking over the power as soon as it is morally and numerically strong enough to not only overthrow the existing non-Islamic, but also to build up a new Islamic authority.”

According to Hugh Fitzgerald, “One must keep in mind both the way in which some atrocities ascribed to Serbs were exaggerated, while the atrocities inflicted on them were minimized or ignored altogether. But what was most disturbing was that there was no context to anything: nothing about the centuries of Muslim rule. Had such a history been discussed early on, Western governments might have understood and attempted to assuage the deep fears evoked by the Bosnian Muslim leader, Izetbegovic, when he wrote that he intended to create a Muslim state in Bosnia and impose the Sharia not merely there, but everywhere that Muslims had once ruled in the Balkans. Had the Western world shown the slightest intelligent sympathy or understanding of what that set off in the imagination of many Serbs (and elsewhere, among the Christians in the Balkans and in Greece), there might never have been such a violent Serbian reaction, and someone like Milosevic might never have obtained power.”

In 1809, after the battle on Cegar Hill, by order of Turkish pasha Hurshid the skulls of the killed Serbian soldiers were built in a tower, Skull Tower, on the way to Constantinople. 3 meters high, Skull Tower was built out of 952 skulls as a warning to the Serbian people not to oppose their Muslim rulers. Some years later, a chapel was built over the skulls.

Similar Jihad massacres were committed not only against the Serbs, but against the Greeks, the Bulgarians and other non-Muslims who slowly rebelled against the Ottoman Empire throughout the 19th century. Professor Vahakn Dadrian and others have clearly identified Jihad as a critical factor in the Armenian genocide in the early 20th century.

As Efraim Karsh notes, “The Ottomans embarked on an orgy of bloodletting in response to the nationalist aspirations of their European subjects. The Greek war of independence of the 1820’s, the Danubian uprisings of 1848 and the attendant Crimean war, the Balkan explosion of the 1870’s, the Greco-Ottoman war of 1897—all were painful reminders of the costs of resisting Islamic imperial rule.”

In his book Onward Muslim Soldiers, Robert Spencer quotes a letter describing the oppression of dhimmis, written in 1860 by the British Consul in Sarajevo, James Zohrab:

“The hatred of the Christians toward the Bosniak Mussulmans is intense. During a period of nearly 300 years they were subjected to much oppression and cruelty. For them no other law but the caprice of their masters existed... Oppression cannot now be carried on as openly as formerly, but it must not be supposed that, because the Government employés do not generally appear as the oppressors, the Christians are well treated and protected.”

Yosef Bodansky, director of the Congressional Task Force on Terrorism and Conventional Warfare in



Washington in the USA, has stated that the Balkans was a “springboard for Islamic extremism” in Europe, with the Islamic Republic of Iran as the main driving force behind it. Iran and Saudi Arabia supplied funding, weapons and men to the Bosnians during the war following the disintegration of Yugoslavia in the 1990s, and terrorist organization Al-Qaeda gained a foothold in the Balkans. Saudi Arabia has invested more than \$1 billion in the Sarajevo region alone, for projects that include the construction of 158 mosques. Apparently, the Islamic dhimmitude-system is slowly returning for the remaining non-Muslims in this former province of the Ottoman Empire.

The Bosnian capital of Sarajevo has become an entirely Muslim city, a Croat deputy in the Bosnian Parliament, Branko Zrno, said in August 2008. Christian Serbs and Croats have no institutional protection and continue to leave the capital. Non-Muslims suffer discrimination and are denied their rights. Zrno said that the Croatian presence in the city has been halved and that neither Croats nor Serbs hold any important posts in local government. Serbs claim that in the city of 400,000 only 7,000 Serbs have remained, compared to 160,000 before the 1992-1995 civil war. The Serb claims have been supported by the Muslim President of the Bosnian Helsinki committee for human rights, Srdjan Dizdarevic, who said in a recent interview that Sarajevo had become a “monoethnic” city. “Over 90 percent of Sarajevo inhabitants belong to only one group, the Bosniacs,” Dizdarevic told weekly Fokus. “Ethnic cleansing in this city has, unfortunately, been successfully completed. If the will exists to reconstruct Bosnia on multiethnic principles, one should start with Sarajevo,” he concluded.

Dimitar Angelov elucidates the impact of the Ottoman Jihad on the vanquished Balkan populations:

“...the conquest of the Balkan Peninsula accomplished by the Turks over the course of about two centuries caused the incalculable ruin of material goods, countless massacres, the enslavement and exile of a great part of the population — in a word, a general and protracted decline of productivity, as was the case with Asia Minor after it was occupied by the same invaders. This decline in productivity is all the more striking when one recalls that in the mid-fourteenth century, as the Ottomans were gaining a foothold on the peninsula, the States that existed there — Byzantium, Bulgaria and Serbia — had already reached a rather high level of economic and cultural development....The campaigns of Mourad II (1421-1451) and especially those of his successor, Mahomet II (1451-1481) in Serbia, Bosnia, Albania and in the Byzantine principdom of the Peloponnesus, were of a particularly devastating character.”

This Ottoman Jihad tradition is still continued by “secular” Turkey to this day. Michael J. Totten visited Varosha, the Ghost City of Cyprus, in 2005. The city was deserted during the Turkish invasion of Cyprus in 1974 and is now fenced off and patrolled by the Turkish occupiers. The Turks carved up the island. Greek Cypriot citizens in Varosha expected to return to their homes within days. Instead, the Turks seized the empty city and wrapped it in fencing and wire.

In March 2006, Italian Luigi Geninazzi made a report from the same area. 180,000 persons live in the northern part of the island, 100,000 of whom are colonists originally from mainland Turkey. According to Geninazzi, the Islamization of the north of Cyprus has been concretized in the destruction of all that was Christian. Yannis Eliades, director of the Byzantine Museum of Nicosia, calculates that 25,000 icons have disappeared from the churches in the zone occupied by the Turks. Stupendous Byzantine and Romanesque churches, imposing monasteries, mosaics and frescoes have been sacked, violated, and destroyed. Many have been turned into restaurants, bars, and nightclubs. Geninazzi confronted Huseyn Ozel, a government spokesman for the self-proclaimed Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus, with this. Most of the mosques in Greek Cypriot territory have been restored. So why are churches still today being turned into mosques? The Turkish Cypriot functionary spreads his arms wide: “It is an Ottoman custom...”

“There are religious centres in Bulgaria that belong to Islamic groups financed mostly by Saudi Arabian groups,” the head of Bulgarian military intelligence has warned. According to him, the centres were in southern and southeastern Bulgaria, where the country’s Muslims, mainly of Turkish origin, are concentrated, and “had links with similar organisations in Kosovo, Bosnia and Macedonia. For them Bulgaria seems to be a transit point to Western Europe.” He said the steps were taken to prevent terrorist groups gaining a foothold in Bulgaria, which shares a border with Turkey. Bulgaria’s Muslim minority accounts for more than 10 percent of the country’s population.

The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia passed a law allowing ethnic Albanians to display the Albanian national flag in areas where they form the majority. The decision came as a result of seven months of heavy



fighting in 2001 involving Albanian separatists, and following pressure from the European Union, always ready to please Muslims.

Ethnic Albanians make up about 25 per cent of Macedonia's population. If the demographic trends are anything like in Kosovo, where the predominantly Muslim Albanians have been out-breeding their non-Muslim neighbors, Macedonians could be facing serious trouble in the future. In Kosovo, dozens of churches and monasteries have been destroyed or damaged following ethnic cleansing of Christian Serbs, all under the auspices of NATO soldiers.

Raphael Israeli in his 2008 book *The Islamic Challenge in Europe* tracks the Islamization of various European countries, from Switzerland to Britain, and describes efforts to recreate the Ottoman Empire and use the Balkans as a launching pad for Jihad:

"After the fall of Communism in the new regime recognized, in 1991, the self-declared Republic of Kosovo, and its head, Ibrahim Rugova, opened an office in Tirana. The disintegration of Yugoslavia by necessity revived the old dreams of the Greater Albania, which now eyed not only Kosovo, but also parts of Macedonia, Greece, Serbia, and Montenegro where an Albanian population had settled over the years. The rising of Muslim consciousness in the Balkans, after the Bosnian precedent...now acts as a catalyst to draw together, under the combined banners of Greater Albania and Islam, all the Albanian populations of that region. In 1992 joined the Conference of Islamic Countries, and it has been working to attract support by other Islamic countries to the Greater Albania plan, actually presenting itself as 'the shield of Islam' in the Balkans. It has been noted that while the Albanian demographic explosion in Kosovo, which has allowed them to predominate and demand secession, has not taken place in Albania itself, perhaps an indication, as in Palestine and Bosnia, that the 'battle of the womb' heralded by nationalists and Muslim fundamentalists, is not merely a natural growth but may be also politically motivated."

Miroljub Jevtic, professor at the Belgrade University and author of a number of books on the topic of Islam and politics, believes the Western world is in favor of detaching Kosovo from Christian Serbia by fiat and making it into an independent (Muslim) state. The main argument of those supporting this scenario, notably in the United States, is to improve their image in the eyes of the Islamic world and "co-opt the influence of Islamic 'extremists'."

Jevtic notes that "the fact that since the arrival of NATO to Kosovo over 150 Christian churches have been destroyed and some 400 mosques have been built, or are under construction, is for the Muslims a proof that if there is a faith which is supported by true God — it is Islam! Because, why would the Christian God, why would Jesus, permit the destruction of churches, where He, Jesus, is glorified? Why would He, at the same time, permit the construction of mosques, where His existence as God is denied? Why would He permit it, moreover, in the presence of men who bear arms and who claim to be Christians?"

Miroljub Jevtic warns that the European Union's support for Albanian Muslim demands could backfire badly: "Granting the independence to Kosovo will be taken as proof of Europe's own wish to cease to exist, as it not only allows the expansion of Islam but is actively promoting it by aiding those who are destroying churches, raping nuns, spitting on crosses and daubing with excrement holy images of Christ."

In Kosovo, dozens of churches and monasteries have been destroyed following ethnic cleansing of Christian Serbs by the predominantly Muslim Albanians, all under the auspices of NATO soldiers, and Muslims are not ungrateful. Kosovo Albanians plan to honor their "savior," former US President Bill Clinton, by erecting a statue of him. Yet in 2007, four Albanians from Kosovo along with other Muslims were arrested for conspiring to attack Fort Dix, a military base in New Jersey, the USA, in order "to kill as many soldiers as possible."

Western governments are pushing for independence for a group of Jihadist thugs who recently wanted to create the Osama bin Laden mosque in Kosovo. This name was eventually changed for public relations reasons since the Albanians knew they needed American political support. In June 2007 the visiting US President George W. Bush was hailed as a hero by a group of Albanians, who allegedly also stole his watch. "Sooner rather than later you've got to say 'Enough's enough — Kosovo is independent,'" Bush told cheering Albanians. As German newspaper Süddeutsche Zeitung later commented, "Why should the Albanians settle for autonomy when George W. Bush had already promised them their own state?"

President Bush declared a “War on Terror” after the Jihadist attacks in 2001. There have been no major terrorist attacks in the US between 2001 and 2008, which is a positive achievement. Nevertheless, the primary thing he has achieved is bleeding American tax payers financially and American soldiers literally while overseeing the eradication of non-Muslim communities in Iraq, and while the Islamization of the West continues unabated. His administration supports independence for terrorist-sponsoring Muslims in the Balkans and in the Palestinian territories. I suspect he will be judged harshly by future historians. But then virtually all Western leaders have failed during this time, not just him. Our societies have failed.

In a commentary, “We bombed the wrong side?” former Canadian UNPROFOR Commander Lewis MacKenzie wrote, “The Kosovo-Albanians have played us like a Stradivarius. We have subsidized and indirectly supported their violent campaign for an ethnically pure and independent Kosovo. We have never blamed them for being the perpetrators of the violence in the early ‘90s and we continue to portray them as the designated victim today in spite of evidence to the contrary. When they achieve independence with the help of our tax dollars combined with those of bin Laden and al-Qaeda, just consider the message of encouragement this sends to other terrorist-supported independence movements around the world.”

Martti Ahtisaari, former President of Finland and later Chief United Nations negotiator for Kosovo, caused anger in Serbia when he stated that “Serbs are guilty as a people,” implying that they would have to pay for it, possibly by losing the province of Kosovo. I disagree with him. It is one thing to criticize the brutality of the Milosevic regime. It is quite another thing to claim that “Serbs are guilty as a people.” If anybody in the Balkans can be called guilty as a people, it is the Turks, not the Serbs. The Turks have left a trail of blood across much of Europe and the Mediterranean for centuries, culminating in the Armenian genocide in the 20th century, which Turkey still refuses to acknowledge, let alone apologize for.

One of the last news items I added for this book was the announcement that the Nobel Peace Prize for 2008 was awarded to Finnish diplomat Martti Ahtisaari for three decades of mediation around the world. Serbian politicians and analysts reacted with dismay to the information. Belgrade analyst Cvijetin Milivojevic laughed when he heard about it. “Ahtisaari negotiated no peace in Kosovo, but awarded ethnic Albanians a state on Serbian territory,” Milivojevic told Adnkronos International ( [AKI](#) ). “He was, in fact, rewarded for carrying out the orders of the major powers.” Ahtisaari was the only international mediator whose plan was not approved by the UN Security Council, but was implemented in Kosovo by a policy of force supported by both the USA and the EU.

Kosovo President Fatmir Sejdiu congratulated former Finnish President Ahtisaari for winning the Nobel Peace Prize, saying it was given to the most deserving person. Ahtisaari is regarded as a villain in Serbia and a hero in Kosovo over his mediation in talks on the status of Kosovo in 2005-2007. The talks failed, but Ahtisaari hammered out a Western-backed road map to independence. Kosovo’s Albanian majority declared independence in February 2008, using his plan. The Kosovo assembly welcomed Ahtisaari’s prize as a “victory” which will help in further recognition of Kosovo’s independence.

Just for the record: I’m not blaming Ahtisaari personally for the Kosovo mess; he was a tool for NATO. But his role contributed to his winning the Peace Prize, and I think that’s wrong.

I once listened to a speech by Patrick Sookhdeo, a brave former Muslim who has published books such as Global Jihad: The Future in the Face of Militant Islam. Sookhdeo had done a lot of excellent — and frightening — research regarding the Islamization of Western Europe, especially Britain. He recalled having a conversation with a senior Western official regarding what would happen if Muslims in a region of, say, Britain or the Netherlands, should declare that they would no longer accept the laws of the central government and formed a breakaway Islamic Republic. This official then replied that they would probably have to quietly accept that. When witnessing Muslim riots in France and elsewhere, which more and more resemble a civil war, this question is no longer just hypothetical.

As writer Julia Gorin has warned, “An independent Kosovo will serve as a nod to secessionists worldwide,” and “history will show what no one cares to understand: the current world war began officially in Yugoslavia.”

Granting Jihadists independence in Kosovo after they conducted ethnic cleansing of non-Muslims has established an extremely dangerous precedent. Not only is it immoral to sacrifice the freedom or existence of smaller nations, be that the Serbs or the Israelis, in order to save your own skin. As the example of

Czechoslovakia demonstrated prior to WW2, it is also counterproductive. Supporting independence for Muslim Albanians in Kosovo will not lead to stabilization of the Balkans; it will rather lead to the Balkanization of the West. The new thug state will serve as a launching pad for Jihad activities against non-Muslims, just like an independent Palestinian state would do in the Middle East. In Kosovo, the Russians are right and Western leaders, both in the European Union and the United States, are wrong. The Serbs have suffered enough and don't need to be stabbed in the back by the West as well.

Janos (John) Hunyadi, Hungarian warrior and captain-general, is today virtually unknown outside Hungary and the Balkans, but he probably did more than any other individual in stemming the Turkish invasion in the fifteenth century. His actions spanned all the countries of south-eastern Europe, leading international armies, negotiating with kings and popes. He died of plague after having destroyed an Ottoman fleet outside Belgrade in 1456. His work slowed the Muslim advance, and may thus have saved Western Europe from falling to Islam. By extension, he may have helped save Western civilization in North America and Australia, too. Yet hardly anybody in West knows who he is. Our children don't learn his name, they are only taught about the evils of Western colonialism and the dangers of Islamophobia.

Western Europe today is a strange and very dangerous mix of arrogance and self-loathing. Muslims are creating havoc and attacking their non-Muslim neighbors from Thailand to India. It is extremely arrogant to believe that the result will be any different in the Netherlands, Britain or Italy, or for that matter in the United States or Canada, than it has been everywhere else. It won't. If we had the humility to listen to the advice of the Hindus of India or even our Christian cousins in south-eastern Europe, we wouldn't be in as much trouble as we are now.

On the other hand, if we didn't have such a culture of self-loathing, where our own cultural traditions are ridiculed in favor of a meaningless Multicultural cocktail, we probably wouldn't have allowed massive Muslim immigration, either. There doesn't have to be a contradiction between being proud of your cultural heritage and knowing that there may still be lessons you can learn from others. A wise man can do both. Westerners of our age do neither.

Sun Tzu, a contemporary of the great Chinese thinker Confucius, wrote *The Art of War*, the extremely influential book on military strategy, 2500 years ago. It is a book that deserves to be read in full, but one of the most famous quotations is this one: "So it is said that if you know your enemies and know yourself, you will not be imperiled in a hundred battles; if you do not know your enemies but do know yourself, you will win one and lose one; if you do not know your enemies nor yourself, you will be imperiled in every single battle."

The West has forgotten who our enemies are, but worse, we have also forgotten who we are. We are going to pay a heavy price for this historical amnesia.

## Reparations from Muslims?

*This essay was first published at Pamela Geller's website Atlas Shrugs in September 2008. It is republished here with a few changes.*

In early September 2008, demands were made that France must make reparations for its colonial past in Algeria. The calls followed the signing between Italy and Libya of a 5 billion dollar investment agreement to resolve colonial-era disputes. The 25-year deal includes the construction of a highway running between Egypt and Tunisia and the return to Libya of a prized ancient marble statue taken to Rome in colonial times. The settlement was a “complete and moral acknowledgement of the damage inflicted on Libya by Italy during the colonial period,” said Italy’s Prime Minister Silvio Berlusconi. “Italy committed historic errors in Libya, and the Italian government’s move to apologise is positive,” secretary of Algeria’s National Liberation Front (FLN) party, Al-Said Abu Haja, told Algerian daily El-Khabar. The FLN led the war of independence from France between 1954 and 1962. “We hope that the European Union will be able to put pressure on other former colonial powers such as France and get it to make amends for what it did in Algeria,” Haja added. “Algeria asked for France to apologise long before Libya [asked Italy]. The French occupied us for 130 years.”

I’m not an expert on French colonial history, but if I recall correctly, the French were at least partly motivated for establishing themselves in Algeria due to the Barbary pirates, who continued their evil activities well into the nineteenth century. The period of French colonial rule is the only period of civilization Algeria has experienced since the Romans. Muslims have been raiding Europe, especially the southern regions but sometimes even north of the Alps, continuously since the seventh century. In fact, the only period during more than 1300 years they haven’t done this was during the time of European colonialism. That’s what they are whining about now. This is compensation for lost jizya. Moreover, there are now more North Africans in France than there ever were Frenchmen in North Africa. If non-Europeans can resist colonization and expel intruders, why can’t Europeans do the same thing?

What about the Spanish and the Portuguese, who were under colonial rule far longer than were the Algerians? As Ibn Warraq says in his book Defending the West:

“Where the French presence lasted fewer than four years before they were ignominiously expelled by the British and Turks, the Ottomans had been the masters of Egypt since 1517, a total of 280 years. Even if we count the later British and French protectorates, Egypt was under Western control for sixty-seven years, Syria for twenty-one years, and Iraq for only fifteen — and, of course, Saudi Arabia was never under Western control. Contrast this with southern Spain, which was under the Muslim yoke for 781 years, Greece for 381 years, and the splendid new Christian capital that eclipsed Rome — Byzantium — which is still in Muslim hands. But no Spanish or Greek politics of victimhood apparently exist.”

From their strongholds in the Iberian Peninsula and elsewhere, Muslims raided the Mediterranean for many centuries. Here is Timothy Gregory in A History of Byzantium:

“In 826/8 Crete was taken by Arab adventurers from Spain, and in 827/9 Spanish Arabs were able to establish footholds in Sicily. The Arab presence on these two islands was to have serious repercussions for Byzantium. Crete became a base for Arab ‘pirates’ who made the Aegean and its shorelines unsafe for the Byzantines and presumably also disrupted trade in the area. The Arab bases on Sicily were the beginning of a long contest between Byzantines and Arabs for control of southern Italy and Sicily that was also to involve the papacy and, eventually, other powers from Western Europe. The Arabs also used these Sicilian bases to raid Italy and the Balkans.”

In 846 some Muslim Arabs arrived in a fleet at the mouth of the Tiber, made their way to Rome, sacked the city, and carried away from the basilica of St. Peter all of the gold and silver it contained. As Sandro Magister states:

“In 827 the Arabs had conquered Sicily, which they kept under their dominion for two and a half centuries. Rome was under serious threat from nearby. In 847, the year after the assault, the newly elected pope Leo IV began the construction of walls around the entire perimeter of the Vatican, 12 meters high and equipped with 44 towers. He completed the project in six years. These are the ‘Leonine’ walls, and significant traces of them still remain. But very few today know that these walls were erected to defend the see of Peter from an Islamic jihad in the ninth century, during which Rome was assaulted and Sicily was conquered, the Muslim armies occupied Bari and Brindisi in Italy for thirty years; Taranto for forty; Benevento for ten; they attacked Naples, Capua, Calabria, and Sardinia several times; they put the abbey of Montecassino to fire and the sword; they even made skirmishes in northern Italy, arriving from Spain and crossing over the Alps.”

The reason why the Vatican became a “city within the city” in Rome with fortifications was due to repeated attacks by Muslims (Saracens). Here are a couple of quotes from the book Rome: Art & Architecture, edited by Marco Bussagli:

“Leo IV’s major building project is generally considered to be the fortification of the Vatican area. After the devastation wrought by the Saracens in St. Peter’s, profoundly shocking to the Christian world, it was decided to fortify the area around St. Peter’s tomb. Leo III had already made this decision, but little had been done because of the theft of the materials set aside for the job. Leo IV, who had already undertaken the repair of the Aurelian walls, gates, and towers, organized the work in such a way that within four years he saw it complete. On June 27, 852 the ceremony of consecration of the walls was performed, in the presence of the pope and clergy, who, barefoot and with heads smeared with ashes, processed round the entire circuit of the fortifications, sprinkling them with holy water and at every gate calling on divine protection against the enemy that threatened the inhabitants. The enclosed area was to take on the status of a city in its own right, which was both separate and distinct from the *Urbe* of Rome, despite its proximity to it.”

“Despite defeat in 849 and 916 in the coastal cities of Naples, Gaeta, and Amalfi, the Saracens continued to lay waste to the countryside and sack the outskirts of Rome, causing the already precarious living conditions of the urban population to deteriorate still further. In the face of this continuing external threat, not only was the Vatican area fortified, but the churches of San Sebastiano on the Appian Way, Sant’Agnese on Via Nomentana, and San Lorenzo on Via Tiburtina were strengthened.”

Among the finest sets of chess from medieval times are the Lewis Chessmen, believed to have been made in Trondheim, Norway, in the twelfth century. They were carved from walrus ivory, which was often imported from the Norse colony in Greenland. According to Jared Diamond in Collapse:

“Greenland’s most prized exports mentioned in Norwegian records were five products derived from Arctic animals rare or absent in most of Europe: walrus ivory from walrus tusks, walrus hide (valued because it yielded the strongest rope for ships), live polar bears or their hides as a spectacular status symbol, tusks of the narwhal (a small whale) known then in Europe as unicorn horns, and live gyrfalcons (the world’s largest falcon). Walrus tusks became the only ivory available in medieval Europe for carving after Moslems gained control of the Mediterranean, thereby cutting off supplies of elephant ivory to Christian Europe. As an example of the value placed on Greenland gyrfalcons, 12 of those birds sufficed in 1396 to ransom the Duke of Burgundy’s son after he was captured by the Saracens [Muslims].”

It is interesting to notice how Diamond, who usually ignores Islam in his writings, casually mentions the fact that Muslims “controlled the Mediterranean” and “cut Europe off” from contact with other cultures. Jihad piracy, slavery and attacks on European countries remained a constant menace from the seventh century until the so-called Barbary States in North Africa in the nineteenth century. Some would argue that it is resurfacing again now, for instance in the form of kidnapping of Western tourists which is becoming increasingly common as I write these words, encouraged by the ransom money often paid by European authorities.

The Age of Exploration during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries was undertaken in order to get away from Muslims and re-establish contact with the civilizations of Asia without hostile middlemen. Norman Davies



puts it this way in his monumental Europe: A History:

“Islam’s conquests turned Europe into Christianity’s main base. At the same time the great swathe of Muslim territory cut the Christians off from virtually all direct contact with other religions and civilizations. The barrier of militant Islam turned the [European] Peninsula in on itself, severing or transforming many of the earlier lines of commercial, intellectual and political intercourse.”

There were no universities in the Islamic world. I have encountered few if any institutions outside of Europe that I would call “universities” in the Western sense before modern times. Among the best candidates is the Great Monastery of Nalanda in India, which was a Buddhist institution. It was not built by Muslims, it was destroyed by Muslims.

Already before AD 1300, Europeans had created an expanding network of universities, an institution that had no real equivalent in any other civilization on earth, and had invented mechanical clocks and eyeglasses, which was also not done in any other civilization. It is easy to underestimate the importance of this, but the ability to make accurate measurements of natural phenomena was of vital importance during the Scientific and Industrial Revolutions. The use of glass lenses for eyeglasses led directly to the development of the microscope and the telescope and the birth of modern medicine and astronomy. The network of universities facilitated the spread of information and debate and served as an incubator for many later scientific advances. All of these innovations were made centuries before European colonialism had begun, indeed at a time when Europe itself was a victim of colonialism and had been so for many centuries. Parts of Spain were still under Islamic occupation, an aggressive Jihad was being waged by the Turks in the remaining Byzantine lands, and the coasts from France via Italy to Croatia had been subject to centuries of Islamic raids.

Muslims complain because they want the good, old days of jizya payments back.

Those who were hit the hardest were the Balkan populations. The Balkans, with its close connections to Byzantium, was a reasonably sophisticated region of Europe in medieval times, until the Ottomans Turks devastated much of the area. One of the most appalling aspects of this was the practice of *devshirme*, the collecting of boys among the Christian minorities who were forcibly converted to Islam and taught to hate their own kin. Dr. Andrew G. Bostom, author of the books The Legacy of Islamic Antisemitism and The Legacy of Jihad, quotes the work of scholar Vasiliki Papoulia, who highlights the continuous desperate struggle of the Christian populations against this forcefully imposed Ottoman levy:

“It is obvious that the population strongly resented...this measure [and the levy] could be carried out only by force. Those who refused to surrender their sons— the healthiest, the handsomest and the most intelligent— were on the spot put to death by hanging. Nevertheless we have examples of armed resistance. In 1565 a revolt took place in Epirus and Albania. The inhabitants killed the recruiting officers and the revolt was put down only after the sultan sent five hundred janissaries in support of the local sanjak—bey. We are better informed, thanks to the historic archives of Yerroia, about the uprising in Naousa in 1705 where the inhabitants killed the Silahdar Ahmed Celebi and his assistants and fled to the mountains as rebels. Some of them were later arrested and put to death.”

The Christian subjects tried for centuries to combat this evil practice:

“Since there was no possibility of escaping [the levy] the population resorted to several subterfuges. Some left their villages and fled to certain cities which enjoyed exemption from the child levy or migrated to Venetian— held territories. The result was a depopulation of the countryside. Others had their children marry at an early age...Nicephorus Angelus...states that at times the children ran away on their own initiative, but when they heard that the authorities had arrested their parents and were torturing them to death, returned and gave themselves up. La Giulletiere cites the case of a young Athenian who returned from hiding in order to save his father’s life and then chose to die himself rather than abjure his faith. According to the evidence in Turkish sources, some parents even succeeded in abducting their children after they had been recruited. The most

successful way of escaping recruitment was through bribery. That the latter was very widespread is evident from the large amounts of money confiscated by the sultan from corrupt...officials.”

Lee Harris in his book The Suicide of Reason describes how this practice of *devshirme*, the process of culling the strongest and fittest “alpha boys,” targeted the non-Muslim subject populations:

“The bodyguard of Janissaries ‘had the task of protecting the sovereign from internal and external enemies,’ writes scholar Vasiliki Papoulia. ‘In order to fulfill this task it was subjected to very rigorous and special training, the janissary education famous in Ottoman society. This training made possible the spiritual transformation of Christian children into ardent fighters for the glory of the sultan and their newly acquired Islamic faith.’ Because the Christian boys had to be transformed into single-minded fanatics, it was not enough that they simply inherit their position. They had to be brainwashed into it, as we would say today, and this could be done most effectively with boys who had been completely cut off from all family ties. By taking the boys from their homes, and transporting them to virtually another world, *devçirme* assured that there would be no conflict of loyalties between family and duty to the empire. All loyalty would be focused on the group itself and on the sultan.”

This practice drained the strength of the Christian populations. Harris again:

“The culling of these alpha boys had two effects, both of them good for the Ottoman Empire, both bad for the subject population. By filling the critical posts in the Ottoman Empire with boys who had been selected on the basis of their intrinsic merit, and not on their family connection, the Empire was automatically creating a meritocracy — if a boy was tough, courageous, intelligent, and fanatically loyal, he was able to work his way up the Ottoman hierarchy; indeed, as we have seen, he became a member of the ruling elite, despite having the formal title of being the sultan’s slave. The Ottoman Empire was both strengthening itself through acquiring these alpha boys, and weakening its subject population by taking their best and brightest. Thanks to the institution of *devçirme*, the more ‘fit’ Christian boys who would be most likely to be the agents of rebellion against the Empire become the fanatical Muslim warriors who were used to suppress whatever troubles the less ‘fit’ Christian boys left behind were able to cause.”

Now that the entire Western world is under attack by Islamic Jihad, we would do well to listen to those who know the frontlines, such as Serge Trifkovic in his book Defeating Jihad.

The wars in the Balkans all the way into the 21st century are a direct result of the legacy of Turkish Muslim brutality. So why does nobody demand that the Turks apologize in public for their massacres and oppression? They should pay reparations to their former subjects, starting with the Armenians, who suffered a Jihad genocide less than a century ago, and continuing with the Serbs, the Bulgarians, the Greeks, the Croats and others who have suffered hundreds of years of abuse and exploitation at their hands.

We can continue with all those European countries that have suffered attacks and enslavement by North African Barbary pirates for more than a thousand years. These nations should now demand public apologies and substantial financial reparations from Arabs and Turks. If these countries lack the funds to pay, we should hold the Islamic world collectively responsible and demand compensation from the rich members of the Organization of the Islamic Conference such as Saudi Arabia. While we are at it, why not demand compensation to all victims of Jihad, from the Jews who have been expelled from the Middle East to the Indians, who have died in the tens of millions for a thousand years or more?

## The Spanish and the Portuguese — Once and Future Dhimmis?

*This essay was first published at the Gates of Vienna blog in June 2008. It is republished here with some additions.*

In May 2008, the President of the European Commission, José Manuel [Barroso](#), stated that Islam is part and parcel of Europe and condemned the concept of a clash of civilizations. “Islam today is part of Europe. It is important to understand this. One should not see Islam as outside Europe. We already have an important presence of Islam and Muslims among our citizens,” Barroso told a press conference after a dialogue between EU leaders and twenty high-level representatives of Christianity, Judaism and Islam in Europe. The Grand Mufti of Bosnia-Herzegovina, Dr. Mustafa Cerić, responded that Islam is indeed part of Europe but unfortunately Turkey is not yet part of Europe. “Following this logic Europe has to prove that Islam is part of Europe by not delaying the acceptance of Turkey to the EU,” he said.

I find this especially sad since Mr. Barroso, prior to becoming the unelected leader of the EU, was Prime Minister of Portugal, a country that was for centuries under the Islamic yoke. Do the Portuguese miss their past status as dhimmis? The reaction of the Nordic countries to mass immigration and Muslim intimidation, with the exception of Denmark, has been pathetic. I’m certainly not proud of it, but at the very least countries such as Norway, Finland and the Baltic nations have had little historical exposure to Muslims. The Portuguese and the Spanish do not have this excuse, after centuries of Islamic occupation and hard struggles to regain control over their lands, which makes their current actions all the more difficult to understand.

Some Portuguese readers assured me that the situation was worse in other Western European countries than in Portugal, partly because other nations have more developed welfare states and are thus more attractive for those seeking welfare payments. I admit I know less about the situation in Portugal than in Spain, which is why I will concentrate mainly on Spain here. I do of course not believe that all Portuguese are like Barroso, just like not all Spaniards are like Zapatero (thank God). If all Europeans were like are so-called leaders, we would already be lost. But on the other hand, I haven’t seen anything indicating that Portugal is immune from the problems of the rest of Western Europe.

Observer [Soeren Kern](#) thinks that “Since Spanish Socialists (more often than not) have trouble winning arguments on their own merit, the preferred tactic is to demonize their opponents instead.” He’s undoubtedly correct about that, although I do not see how that makes Spanish Socialists different from their counterparts elsewhere. According to Kern:

“Italian voters in April [2008] [returned Prime Minister Silvio Berlusconi to a third term](#) in office. The center-right leader was given a strong mandate to crack down on runaway immigration and spiraling street crime, two hot-button issues that are [intrinsically linked](#), not just in the minds of Italians, but in those of many other Europeans too, especially in Spain. As a result, Spanish Socialists are (rightly) worried that Berlusconi’s get-tough approach will jeopardize their own fantastical vision of turning Europe into a post-modern multicultural utopia. It therefore comes as no big surprise that Spanish Socialist Deputy Prime Minister [María Teresa Fernández de la Vega](#), who is also commonly known as Spain’s high-priestess of political correctness, recently [lashed out](#) at the no-nonsense immigration policies of the new Italian government. [Her pontifical rebuke](#) declared that the Spanish executive ‘rejects violence, racism and xenophobia, and therefore cannot agree with what is happening in Italy.’” Moreover, “By rewarding illegal immigrants with Spanish (and thus European) documentation, Zapatero has unleashed what is known as the ‘[call effect](#)’ to people as far away as Kashmir who now believe that Spain is an easy gateway into Europe.”

Gustavo de [Aristegui](#), the foreign affairs spokesman for the conservative (but in my view still a bit too soft) Popular Party, explains in his book [The Jihad in Spain: The obsession to reconquer Al-Ándalus](#) that, in schools throughout the Muslim world, maps are used with Spain and Portugal colored green because they are still considered part of *dar al-Islam*, or the House of Islam. According to antiterrorist sources, eight Jihadist [groups](#) have settled in Spain, located mostly in Catalonia, Madrid, Andalusia and Valencia. Their threat is real, since most of these sleeping cells “can be activated at any time and perpetrate criminal attacks.”

-----  
As AMDG from the blog [La Yijad en Eurabia](#) says: “The fact that Spain is one of the targets of the Third Jihad is not surprising. Muslims have the religious obligation to expand Islam — mostly political Islam; conversion

can be forced later on in many ways — and in particular they have the compelling obligation to retrieve those lands on which Islam once ruled. Al Andalus — that is Spain, and not only the south of Spain, the modern Andalucía — was once under Mohammedan yoke and is therefore among the priorities of the Jihad. The answer by Spaniards to this threat cannot be more discouraging. Spanish government withdrew its troops from Iraq immediately after the first terrorist attack, even if they were not combat troops. Their next initiative was the proposal of the Alliance of Civilizations.”

The Socialist PM José Luis Rodríguez Zapatero was swept to power by the Jihadist train bombings in Madrid in March 2004, the largest peacetime attacks in Spain’s modern history. He has been surrendering his country to Muslims every day since then. Zapatero, who has said that “sexual equality is a lot more effective against terrorism than military strength,” appointed a pregnant woman as Minister of Defense in April 2008, thus signaling to everybody that his country has no intentions of defending itself.

There are serious plans afoot to create a tunnel linking Spain (and thus Europe) physically to Morocco and Muslim North Africa. The great project of the tunnel under the Strait of Gibraltar will be presented by the two countries to the European Union in mid-October 2008. The announcement was made by Spanish Foreign Minister Miguel Angel Moratinos at the end of a meeting held in Tangier with his Moroccan counterpart, Tayeb Fasi Fihri. The project presentation said that this was “a very ambitious project” which will unite Africa and Europe. According to the most optimistic forecasts, the first railway carriages might pass under the Strait by 2025. As soon as the project is approved by the EU, it is expected to be funded by the World Bank, the European Investment Bank and several Arab investment funds.

As usual in Western countries, Socialists who undermine their own countries are de facto allies with Big Business interests, the same business interests that have championed the borderless EU common market, who desire bigger markets and an abundant supply of cheap labor, and tend to view defended national borders as an obstacle to both. According to a study by the Group for Reflection and Proposal on Business and Immigration, Spain “needs” over two million new foreign workers until 2020, many of whom will undoubtedly be Muslims.

In June 2008, it was announced that an “interfaith meeting” sponsored by Saudi Arabia was to be held in Madrid. The dialogue would be held by the Saudi-based Muslim World League. “Prominent figures among followers of the divine messages will take part in dialogue concerning life in human societies, international cooperation, human rights, and issues of security, peace and living together in the world,” said a statement by the agency. Yet while the Saudi king promotes interfaith dialogue, Saudi school textbooks still teach hatred and intolerance of everything and everyone non-Islamic.

As the Middle East Media Research Institute ( MEMRI ) says, “According to an article in the London daily Al-Hayat, the Arabic language held sway during the Saudi-sponsored interfaith World Conference on Dialogue, held July 16-18, 2008 in Madrid. It is noteworthy that the conference brought Saudi Arabia to the center of the European and international political scene, after France had, one week previously, brought Syria and Qatar to the forefront of politics during the Mediterranean conference in Paris [*proposing the creation of a Mediterranean Union; My note*].”

Here are some excerpts from the Al-Hayat article:

“At Madrid’s international airport, the invitees to the international interfaith dialogue conference were greeted in Arabic; airport officials at passport control and security personnel at the Auditorium Hotel spoke fluent Arabic; [Arabic was spoken at] all conference activities and at the reception held for the occasion. It can [therefore] be said that the Spanish capital, Madrid, speaks Arabic... At the conference, [jointly] sponsored by Saudi King ‘Abdallah bin ‘Abd Al-‘Aziz and Spanish King Juan Carlos, the language of the Koran held sway...The Muslim greeting al-salam ‘aleykum was the expression most frequently used by the participants, who were of all kinds and from all backgrounds. Over 250 Arabic speakers — senior officials, organizers, diplomats, members of the press — were present at the conference, organizing and running [its activities]. Spain has embraced the Arabs and espoused their culture and language. Dialogue, upon which people all over the world have pinned their hopes, may reshape the world.”

These people are obviously not interested in “mutual understanding” on equal terms; they are gloating over what they perceive as a European nation once again submitting to Islamic rule. As I’ve stated in my online



essay [Socratic Dialogue vs. Islamic Dialogue](#), Muslims understand the term “dialogue” in a way that differs sharply from that of Westerners. For them, “dialogue” does not mean an open-ended attempt to rationally debate a topic in order to arrive at the truth. Truth is already given: It’s called sharia, and the only “dialogue” that is acceptable is one that will lead to the implementation of sharia, one way or the other. When they invite to a “dialogue,” they mean that we should negotiate our surrender, or else...

According to [Soeren Kern](#), the “interfaith conference” was organized by the Saudi-sponsored [Muslim World League](#), which happens to be the [principal agent for the propagation of Wahhabi Islam in Europe](#). Zapatero (like his Saudi counterparts, but for different reasons) “views Judeo-Christianity as public enemy number one because it is the main impediment to the realization of his vision for a socialist multicultural utopia in which everything goes. And he hopes his pact with Islam will accelerate Spanish history. Zapatero and his socialist advisors believe Muslims are the ‘useful idiots’ of the left. And Muslims believe Zapatero and his socialist friends are the ‘useful idiots’ of Islam. Such is the future of Spain.”

Poul E. Andersen, former dean of the church of Odense, Denmark, [warns](#) against false hopes of dialogue with Muslims. During a debate at the University of Aarhus, Ahmad Akkari, one of the Muslim participants, stated: “Islam has waged war where this was necessary and dialogue where this was possible. A dialogue can thus only be viewed as part of a missionary objective.” When Mr. Andersen raised the issue of dialogue with the Muslim World League in Denmark, the answer was: “To a Muslim, it is artificial to discuss Islam. In fact, you view any discussion as an expression of Western thinking.”

Since its inception, Islam has been waging an aggressive war against the rest of mankind with the purpose of bringing every single human being on earth under Islamic rule. Infidels have been presented with three options: Convert to Islam, die, or submit under Islamic rule as a dhimmi, a second-rate citizen in your own country subject to serious financial pressure, constant verbal humiliations and frequent physical abuse. Islam hasn’t changed much. Unless we are prepared to accept conversion or dhimmi status, we have to fight back. The Spanish and the Portuguese knew that once. One can only hope that they will remember it again.

Let me conclude by adding some words about infiltration of the democratic system. In [July 2008](#), the congress of the Spanish Socialist Workers’ Party (PSOE) in Madrid was scheduled to approve a motion to propose voting rights to immigrants in local elections, organization secretary and second in the ranks of PSOE, Jose Blanco, said in an interview. According to PSOE’s calculations, quoted by El Pais, the measure will concern 1,300,000 immigrants coming from Muslim countries such Morocco and from Latin America. The new voters might change the political equilibriums in cities where they have a strong presence, like Madrid and Barcelona, and presumably tilt the scales permanently towards the Socialists.

There are setbacks to this strategy. In 2008, when a right-wing coalition brought PM Silvio Berlusconi back to power in Italy, the Northern League and its secretary Umberto [Bossi](#) said: “The workers don’t vote for the Left any more. The Northern League is the new workers’ party.” Nevertheless, it remains true that immigrants from developing countries vote overwhelmingly for left-wing parties that support a generous welfare state. Mass immigration has already tipped the scales in favor of Socialist parties in a number of European elections.

I described this phenomenon in my [essay](#) *Electing a New People: The Leftist — Islamic Alliance*. Since this was published in the spring of 2006, some of the specific details are outdated, but the general conclusion is not: In every single country I have surveyed, from Norway and Denmark via Britain, Germany, Holland and Belgium to Spain, immigrants lean heavily towards the political Left, which means that left-wing parties can simply import a new people to stay in power, at least until immigrants form parties of their own.

Bertolt Brecht (who was himself an apologist for Communist dictatorships) wrote a satirical poem after the 1953 East German risings:

“The solution  
After the uprising of 17 June  
The Secretary of the Writers’ Union  
Had leaflets distributed in the Stalinallee  
Stating that the People  
Had forfeited the confidence of the government  
And could win it back only



By redoubled efforts. Would it not be easier  
In that case for the government  
To dissolve the people  
And elect another?”

At the beginning of the 21st century, electing a new people seems to be exactly what Socialist parties in Europe are doing. Perhaps the greatest idea of the left-wing parties after the Cold War was to re-invent themselves as Multicultural parties and start importing voters from abroad. In addition to this, they have managed to denounce the opposition as racists, bigots and extremists. A new alliance of convenience between Leftists and Muslim immigrants is taking shape. I think the deal is that the Leftist parties get a number of new clients, or voters, in return for giving Muslims privileges and subsidies, as well as keeping the borders more or less open for new Muslims to enter. As one Muslim put it: “I vote for the Socialists because they give me more money.” The Leftists are, in essence, electing a new people, replacing the one already there with one more supportive of their agenda.

There is, of course, nothing new in buying votes and “clients” by promising them access to other people’s money. This was the essence of Leftism in the first place. However, although this is probably a flaw in the democratic system, democracy has still functioned within the borders of stable nation states. This flaw gets a lot more dangerous when combined with massive immigration, where certain political parties import people from other nations, even vocal enemies of their country, to shore up their short-term support in elections. This will in the longer term breed resentment among the native population, who will in this way be forced to fund their own colonization. In the context of Europe, Muslim immigration could turn democracy into a self-defeating system that will eventually break down because native Europeans — correctly, I might add — no longer feel that it serves their interests.

Leftists and Muslims have a mutual short-term interest in keeping the Leftist parties in power, and a mutual long-term interest in weakening the traditional Christian culture of Europe, which Socialists at best view with indifference, at worst as an obstacle blocking the road to their Utopia. Besides, Socialists traditionally place little ideological importance on such trivial matters as national borders. I believe Lenin once said that borders between Soviet Republics were unimportant, as Socialism would transcend all national and religious boundaries and render them a thing of the past, anyway. The idea has never entirely disappeared.

The same collaboration happened in Iran, where popular “reformers” such as Ali Shariati in the years before the 1979 revolution infused Islam with aspects of Western thought and made the Marxists believe that they could coexist with Islam. So they cooperated in overthrowing the Shah — and then all the godless Socialists were the first ones to hang from lamp posts around the country when Khomeini and his Islamic cronies seized power. The secular Leftists in Europe know fully well that they do not agree with religious Muslims on some issues, but they believe they are the senior partners in the alliance and that they can “ride the tiger.” That may be true now, but for how long will the situation remain like this? Who is using whom?

In Denmark, writers Helle Merete Brix, Torben Hansen and Lars Hedegaard believe that the Muslim immigration and the increasing clashes we are witnessing are part of the third Islamic Jihad, a third attempt to conquer and subdue the West. The first one came with the Arabs more than a thousand years ago, the second with the Turks in the early modern era. Will three times be the charm for Muslims? Will they succeed this time?

During the first Jihad, Charles Martel, “The Hammer,” founder of the Carolingian Empire, the first Western power after the fall of Rome, defeated the Arabs in the Battle of Tours in 732, thus saving Western civilization, and by extension much of the world, from Islam.

During the second Jihad, the Turks did manage to conquer Constantinople and much of south-eastern Europe, but Jan Sobieski, king of Poland, routed the Ottoman armies that had laid siege to Vienna in 1683. Leading a combined force of Polish, Austrian and German troops, Sobieski attacked a numerically superior Turkish army until their lines were broken and the Turks fled in confusion. This was the last time Muslims came close to threatening the West in traditional warfare. They now prefer demographic warfare through migration combined with terrorism, and they have in some ways been more successful at infiltrating the democratic West peacefully than they ever were at conquering the pre-democratic West by force. Muslims are already inside Vienna, quietly taking over, and no Sobieski is in sight. In Vienna, Austria in December 2006, Santa

Claus was removed from kindergartens. Municipal officials insisted that the sight of a strange bearded figure would evoke fear in kids, but many observers accused them of kowtowing to a growing Muslim population.

The third Jihad started with the oil embargo, the influx of Saudi petrodollars and the beginnings of Eurabia and Muslim immigration to the West in the 1960s and early 70s. During the third Jihad, Leftists all over Europe seem to be opening the gates of Europe from within. “You want to conquer Europe? That’s ok. Just vote for us and help us get rid of capitalism and eradicate the Christian heritage of Europe, and we’ll let you in. In the meantime, you can enjoy some welfare goodies, and we will ban opposition to this undertaking as racism and hate speech.”

In addition to a destructive ideology of Globalism, the concept that all national borders *should* be erased and that this is a positive good, an ideology held only by the Western world, the situation is made worse by the fact that globalization of transportation has put severe pressure on our nations in a manner which was unthinkable only a few decades ago. When the Christian Gospels were written down at the end of the first century AD, the population of the Roman Empire was perhaps 60 million people, give or take a few million. This mirrors the annual global population growth in the early twenty-first century. In other words:

**The global population grows by another Roman Empire every single year. Our current political and economic system wasn’t designed to cope with such numbers. It needs fundamental change, or it will soon collapse into civil wars or dictatorships or both.**

We have a situation where some parties deliberately import Muslims because they vote overwhelmingly for left-wing parties. A political system where it pays to import enemies isn’t sustainable. Any political system must first and foremost ensure the survival and continued physical existence of the community and nation it serves. After that comes ensuring the prosperity and liberty of this community in the best possible way. However, when I look at the situation in Western countries today, I cannot see that democracy always ensures our liberty and prosperity, and in many cases it functions so poorly that it threatens our survival.

Currently, the democratic system is in my view not working properly in any Western country. It is more or less dead in Western Europe, where most of the real power has been transferred to the unelected organs of the European Union, anyway. Virtually all Western countries have lost control over their borders. This is not a sustainable situation. You can call your political system a democracy, a dictatorship, a republic, a monarchy or whatever you want, but a country that does not control its territory will eventually die.

The most important thing to realize is that democracy is a tool, a means we use to achieve an end. Too many people today confuse it with the end itself. “Democracy” has come to mean something that is good, something everybody wants, a bit like sex or chocolate. But there is no rational reason to assume that democracy of universal suffrage is uniformly good and can be applied with equal success in all circumstances, a huge mistake Americans made in a predominantly Muslims country such as Iraq, where “democracy” and majority rule simply means sharia and state-sponsored harassment of minorities.

Leading Islamic scholar Sheikh Yusuf al-Qaradawi and others have hailed the coming Islamic conquest of Rome, just like Constantinople was conquered in 1453. “Islam will return to Europe as a conqueror and victor, after being expelled from it twice. Islam entered Europe twice and left it... Perhaps we will conquer these lands without armies.” The Saudi Sheikh Muhammad bin Abd Al-Rahman Al-’Arifi, imam of the mosque of King Fahd Defense Academy, concurred: “We will control the land of the Vatican; we will control Rome and introduce Islam in it. Yes, the Christians...will yet pay us the Jizya [poll tax paid by non-Muslims under Muslim rule], in humiliation, or they will convert to Islam...”

Unless native Europeans rebel against the unholy alliance of power-hungry left-wingers, selfish and short-sighted businessmen and treasonous EU elites who continue to import Muslims to our shores, Mr. Qaradawi could end up being right in his predictions.

## Probing the Infidel World

by Baron Bodissey (*Gates of Vienna*), September 15, 2008

Most of us have become familiar in recent years with the concept of a terrorist “probe”, an operation mounted to test the defenses of the West and perhaps throw a feint to keep our security forces off-balance.

The most famous probe was the “Syrian musicians” on Flight 327, as reported by Annie Jacobsen in [Terror in the Skies](#). Ms. Jacobsen persisted in the face of government spokesmen and the media who ridiculed and vilified her in an attempt to cover up official incompetence, but the reality of what she wrote about was later [confirmed](#) by independent investigation. The terror operatives of Flight 327 were apparently seeing how far they could go in a dry run, simulating the assembly of an explosive device in the restroom of the aircraft using components brought on board separately by the “musicians”.

The [infamous “flying imams”](#) were a different sort of probe. Unlike the Syrian musicians, their activities were clearly intended to arouse public suspicion and be exposed, so that CAIR-funded lawsuits could intimidate passengers into ignoring suspicious behavior, and force the government to relax its security procedures on airliners.

In addition to these obvious incidents, Muslims engage in other forms of probing on all fronts of their interactions with the West. Islam is, after all, an entire way of life, and the terror attack is just one aspect of the war that is constantly being waged against the kuffar. In every possible arena of conflict — political, legal, cultural, and military — Islam continually pushes the envelope, testing the limits of infidel tolerance and searching out weaknesses.

Every morning I sit down at this computer with a cup of coffee and make my way through a huge batch of emails. Many of them are tips sent in by our dedicated army of tipsters, who scour the global news outlets and send us anything that looks interesting. This flood of articles sometimes juxtaposes seemingly disparate pieces of information, and patterns emerge that might otherwise go unnoticed.

Today was no exception. Four articles that have nothing to do with one another came through this morning in rapid succession, and made me think of probes.

Here’s the first one. According to [AKI](#):

*Turkey: Spanish PM to Attend Ramadan Dinner With Erdogan*

*Istanbul, 15 Sept. — Spanish Prime Minister Jose Luis Rodriguez Zapatero will attend a fast-breaking Ramadan dinner or ‘iftar’ with his Turkish counterpart, Recep Tayyip Erdogan, in Istanbul on Monday. Iftar is the meal in which Muslims break the fast at the end of the day. According to Turkish media reports, Zapatero will share the meal with Erdogan and 2,500 guests and the two leaders are expected to discuss bilateral, regional and international issues. Erdogan and Zapatero are co-chairs of the United Nations-led Alliance of Civilisations initiative, aimed at improving dialogue and understanding in order to counter extremism.*

So why might this be considered a probe? Mr. Erdogan invited Mr. Zapatero to an iftar dinner; what’s the big deal?

To the average bozo Western politician, it’s no deal at all. It’s another rubber-chicken occasion; you go, you eat, you press the flesh, you ask favors and do people favors — it’s business as usual.

But not to Muslims.

When a kafir [infidel] comes to an iftar dinner, it’s a signal to Muslims that the infidels have conceded their own inferior status as dhimmis. They have acknowledged the supremacy of Islam.

You can bet that’s the signal received by TV viewers across the Muslim world when they see Mr. Zapatero

doing his little multicultural dance on the nightly news.

Think about it: do you ever see a Muslim prime minister or head of state attending a Mass, or a Passover Seder, or a Christmas dinner? No, you don't, not unless it's one of those "interfaith" occasions done up with full multicultural regalia and politically correct piety, where every faith is represented. If a Muslim attended an event dedicated *solely* to the ritual observances of another religion, he would be an apostate. That's why he won't do it.

So it's a probe. "Let's see if the kafir will bow to us: that tells us how far we may push him in the direction of what we want."

Here's another example, this one [from the USA](#) ([MyCentralJersey.com](#)):

#### *For First Time, Plainfield Schools to Close for Islamic Holiday*

*PLAINFIELD — City schools will be closed for an Islamic holiday for the first time in district history when Eid ul-Fitr is celebrated Thursday, Oct. 2. Eid ul-Fitr is the Islamic holy day marking the end of Ramadan, a currently continuing period of sunrise-to-sunset fasting and religious observance representing the holiest month of the Islamic calendar. The school board voted to include the off day on the 2008-09 district calendar during an April meeting. "We believe in celebrating the diversity of our students, staff, parents and community, and we are excited to embrace this holiday," said district information officer Eric Jones. "I think it's a testament to what the Plainfield Public Schools is all about — we believe in celebrating who we are."*

In this case the infidel thinks he's celebrating diversity, but the Muslim knows that he's just moved another small step closer to full official recognition of the Islamic religion in the state of New Jersey. The probing nature of the occasion is made obvious by the next paragraph:

*School board member Rasheed Abdul-Haqq was instrumental in an April push to have both Eid ul-Fitr and Eid al-Adha, a December holy day on the Islamic calendar, included as being districtwide off days. Only the former was included on the calendar, but Abdul-Haqq said he hoped Eid al-Adha — a festival day of celebration and feasting referred to as "The Big Eid" in many heavily Muslim countries around the world — will ultimately be reconsidered as a districtwide off day.*

In other words: "We're not done. The success of this probe will cause us to probe further, and then further still."

*Abdul-Haqq, who is Muslim, said he felt the step to have the one off day still represented a move in the right direction for the district.*

Yes indeed. One small step in the direction of full sharia.

It's happening all over the place:

*"It is getting more and more common... the number of schools (to do so) is increasing every year," said Javed, who added that many local school districts that may not close school for Islamic holidays do not penalize Muslim students who do not attend school those days. "I think this is a positive, that the communities are integrating and recognizing other people's beliefs, respecting other people's religions... I think of it as a good thing for this country."*

A probe here, a probe there. Find the weak point, and probe a little further there. If the probe meets resistance, try another location.

This story from Switzerland seems innocuous enough. There's good money to be made from the manufacture of halal foods, so what's wrong with a commercial operation doing business with Muslims? Money has no religion, right?

According to [Der Spiegel](#):

### *Why a Swiss Village Makes Halal Pastry*

*A Swiss village is churning out puff pastry that adheres to strict Islamic food guidelines and is exported half way across the world. It's all part of the growing global demand for halal food products. Walter Leisi is holding two rolled cylinders of dough in his hands, each wrapped in glossy foil, one labeled in French and the other in Arabic. Each package contains the same puff pastry, a concoction of 196 layers of flour, margarine, butter, water and salt — the same, but for one difference, a tiny but decisive difference: one is preserved with alcohol and the other with potassium sorbate. They taste the same, but they smell somewhat different. The dough preserved with potassium sorbate smells “slightly more cheesy,” says Walter Leisi, 63, a jolly Swiss man wearing a purple short-sleeved shirt and a gold watch. Leisi is the director of a Nestlé plant in the Swiss town of Wangen bei Olten. He is also the inventor of Leisi-Quick, the world's first ready-made puff pastry...More and more Muslims are choosing a devout lifestyle, and this includes strict observance of the dietary restrictions in the Koran, which classify food as being either “halal” or “haram,” allowed or forbidden.*

From an Islamic point of view, an infidel business has decided to conform with the dictates of sharia, and follow halal guidelines. Just as in the case of sharia finance, a Muslim hears an infidel submitting to the will of Allah.

It doesn't matter that the kafir businessman thinks he's done no such thing. To the servants of profit it's a purely commercial decision, but to the servants of the Prophet it's a concession to Islam.

It's another successful probe.

The final example has nothing directly to do with Islam. No Muslims are involved in it. But when I read the story, it made me think of all these different probes.

Many of our readers have heard about the new Swedish law mandating government surveillance of all emails, phone calls, and other telecommunications. But according to [The Copenhagen Post](#), the effects of Den Svenska Storebror will reach far beyond the borders of Sweden:

#### *Journalists Union Warns of Swedish Surveillance*

*A new Swedish anti-terror law that takes effect on 1 January will allow the country's intelligence services to monitor all correspondence going in and out of the country and may include phone calls placed entirely within Denmark, according to the Danish Union of Journalists (DJ). DJ has told its members to stipulate in all their phone calls, emails and other correspondence to Sweden that the material may be listened to or read by the Swedish authorities. The union has also indicated that some emails and phone calls within Denmark may be at risk of being intercepted if the signal passes through Swedish air- or cyberspace. Mogens Blicher Bjerregaard, DJ's president, said the new law will result in many reporters' sources 'clamming up' for fear of reprisals.*

To be fair, the Swedish government has mounted this ambitious operation in order to intercept communications by terrorists and other enemies of the State. But whenever a government votes itself powers such as these, they are inevitably used to monitor and intimidate ordinary citizens. Any tool designed to spy on criminals can just as easily be used to suppress dissent and keep Sven Svensson in line.

Since Sweden has the most exacting Multicultural regime in the world, expect politically incorrect dissidents to be surveilled and harassed. When people become afraid that the government is listening in on their every conversation, they will be that much less likely to object to the party line. They'll be that much more inclined to shut up and resign themselves to whatever is coming their way.

And, needless to say, what's coming their way is an Islamic probe. And then another one. And then another one after that...

All those probes are looking for infidel soft spots, and the softest infidel spot of all is now the entire nation of Sweden.



### **Fjordman's comment:**

In September 2008, Turkey's Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdogan called on the international community to treat "Islamophobia" and criticism of Islam as a "crime against humanity." He said this addressing PM Zapatero, his Spanish partner in the UN-sponsored "Alliance of Civilizations," and many other guests in Istanbul at a celebratory iftar meal.

At the same time in Istanbul, or Constantinople as it was once called, the Patriarchate of Constantinople, the spiritual center for hundreds of millions of Orthodox Christians, has been reduced to a small, besieged enclave in a decaying corner of Istanbul. Almost all of its property has been seized by successive Turkish governments, its prelates are taunted by extremists who demonstrate almost daily outside the Patriarchate, calling for its ouster from Turkey. The ecumenical patriarch is often jeered and threatened when he ventures outside his walled enclave, state bureaucrats take pleasure in harassing him and the authorities block his efforts to make repairs of the few buildings still under his control (one of the traditional stipulations of dhimmi status) and issue veiled threats against him.

Muslims in Turkey feel free to harass the few non-Muslims who remain in the country and have never apologized for one thousand years of ethnic cleansing against Christian Europeans. When Erdogan talks about "dialogue," he means unilateral surrender to Islamic rule, which is exactly what a good Muslims should desire according to Islamic law.

Anatolia, the region we now call "Turkey," was once a land inhabited predominantly by Greek-speaking Christians. The gradual Jihad eradication of these communities has extended well into our own time. As late as in 1955, serious riots broke out in Istanbul, with looting in Greek neighborhoods and the destruction of many churches and synagogues. More than 5,000 shops belonging to the Greek minority were looted by an emotional crowd of several thousand people. The Turkish Muslim riots resulted not only from "fervid chauvinism, or even [from] the economic resentment of many impoverished rioters, but [from] the profound religious fanaticism in many segments of Turkish society." Greeks and Armenians were savagely beaten and there were gang rapes. Turkish writer Aziz Nessim says that any male passer-by the Turks considered a Greek was forced to show if he had been circumcised. In some cases, Nessim says, Turks carried out "circumcisions" on the spot with knives.

## The Execution of Britain

*This essay was first published at The Brussels Journal, June 2008. It is republished here with some additions.*

I will defend all Western and indeed infidel countries against Islamic Jihad, but I admit I feel especially close to Britain, not just because of the long cultural and historic ties between Scandinavia and the British Isles, but also because I appreciate the good that has come out of British culture. It makes me all the more sad to see how humiliated this great nation is today, and how many natives feel forced to leave what once was their country.

In May 2008, 18 year-old Ben Smith was stopped in a routine check. The police officer noticed an English flag on the parcel shelf and ordered him to remove it because it was “racist towards immigrants.” One of the first things foreign powers usually do when they invade a country is to ban its national symbols. The fact that you can no longer run your flag in parts of Britain — and the Netherlands, Sweden, France, etc. — shows that the country is de facto under occupation, not just by Muslims, but by Multiculturalists and Globalists of all kinds.

In an essay entitled Put away the flags, Howard Zinn, the left-wing author of the best-selling book *A People's History of the United States*, writes that “On this July 4, we would do well to renounce nationalism and all its symbols: its flags, its pledges of allegiance, its anthems, its insistence in song that God must single out America to be blessed. Is not nationalism — that devotion to a flag, an anthem, a boundary so fierce it engenders mass murder — one of the great evils of our time, along with racism, along with religious hatred?” He concludes that “We need to assert our allegiance to the human race, and not to any one nation.”

The problem is, rights can only be protected by sovereign states upholding their territorial integrity. How is “the global community” or “the human race” going to protect Mr. Zinn’s liberties? For a free society to function, the state has to pass laws in the best interest of its citizenry and enforce these within its territory. Otherwise, self-government is impossible. In order to defend this territory from outside aggression, people need to identify with it as something more than just a random space on a map. By removing sovereign states, you remove the very foundations of a free society. Maybe some groups actually desire this?

The British Foreign Minister Milliband stated late in 2007 that the European Union should expand to include Muslim nations in North Africa and the Middle East. The French President Sarkozy and the German Chancellor Angela Merkel confirmed this early in 2008. Since the EU involves the free movement of people across borders, European leaders are thus opening the floodgates to tens of millions of Muslims at a time when native Europeans already feel like aliens in their own cities. It’s the greatest betrayal in the history of Western civilization and it has been planned for many years, as those who have read Bat Ye’or’s writings about Eurabia will know.

I believe native Europeans should seriously consider creating a European Indigenous People’s Movement to protect our interests. Our authorities currently reward those who use violence and punish those who don’t. Native Europeans are ignored if we protest peacefully against mass immigration or the expanding pan-European superstate. Muslims get concessions while we are treated with increasing hostility from those who are supposed to be our leaders.

DNA studies have proved that a large majority of those who live in the British Isles today are descended directly from the Ice Age hunters, despite the Roman, Anglo-Saxon, Norse and Norman invasions. This accounts for 88% of the Irish, 81% of the Welsh, 70% of the Scots and 68% of the English. Yet the UK Commission for Racial Equality in 1996 claimed that “everyone who lives in Britain today is either an immigrant or the descendant of an immigrant.” As Professor David Conway demonstrates in his book *A Nation Of Immigrants?*, after the invasion led by William the Conqueror in 1066, the total number of Norman settlers in Britain was never more than five per cent of the population. The inflow now is 25 times any previous level and frequently from totally alien cultures, not from neighboring territories and cultural cousins as previously.

PM Tony Blair expressed “profound relief” over the end of a hostage crisis in 2007 where British soldiers had been kidnapped by the Islamic Republic of Iran, telling the mullahs that “we bear you no ill will.” Blair will be remembered as one of the worst leaders in history. Even Chamberlain didn’t flood his country with enemies

and present this as something positive. Mass immigration has been going on for decades but showed a spectacular increase under Blair's and Brown's Labour regime. The spike was so powerful that it is tempting to speculate whether the authorities had deliberately set out to dismantle their own nation.

According to writer Robert Rowthorn, before Labour came to power, the number of people leaving Britain roughly balanced the number arriving. Then Blair's government "embarked on a policy that will totally change the nature of many of the communities in which we live without consulting any of us. Labour has never formally announced that it is committed to increasing immigration indefinitely. There was nothing about increasing immigration in Labour's manifesto of 1997, or of 2001, or of 2005." Although his government has presided over a virtual explosion of immigration, Blair had the gall to accuse the rivalling Tories of exploiting the issue. He attacked the way the Tories had linked immigration with racism in campaign posters. "It is an attempt deliberately to exploit people's fears, to suggest that for reasons of political correctness, those in power don't dare deal with the issue," he said.

In a British poll from January 2007, a massive 82% disagreed (57% strongly) as to whether the government was in control of immigration. When asked if the government was "open and honest" about the scale of immigration into Britain, 80% disagreed. Sir Andrew Green, chairman of Migrationwatch, said: "After a decade of efforts to stifle debate, there is now a fundamental lack of trust between the Government and the public on this issue." The numbers "reflect a deep underlying resentment among the public that they have not had any opportunity to express their views — still less to be consulted — on a matter of major importance to them and to the future of our country."

Newspaper columnist Leo McKinstry believes that the English are being turned into second-class citizens in their own country: "England is in the middle of a profoundly disturbing social experiment. For the first time in a mature democracy, a Government is waging a campaign of aggressive discrimination against its indigenous population."

Similar things are happening all over the Western world, not just in England or Britain, but Britain is definitely one of the worst countries. I've been debating with people which country is most likely to get the first Eurabian civil war triggered by mass immigration. There are several possible candidates, but my money is on Britain, because the anger among ordinary citizens is only rivaled by the brutal political repression tactics.

In April 2008, David T, a stunned father and his little boy, were banned from swimming at a popular public sports center in east London because this was a "Muslim men-only swimming" session. Several Christian priests have been physically attacked by Muslims in east London, leading one bishop to worry about "no-go-zones" for Christian in some parts of the country. In early June, a Muslim police community support officer ordered Christian preachers to stop handing out gospel leaflets in a predominantly Muslim area of Birmingham. They were threatened with arrest for committing a "hate crime" and were told they risked being beaten up if they returned. In March 2008, two Islamic terrorists were moved to different prisons after complaining that their fellow inmates were "too white." Dhiren Barot had masterminded a radioactive bomb plot involving limousines packed with nails and explosives and Omar Khyam plotted to blow up the Bluewater shopping centre in Kent.

Keith Best, head of the Immigration Advisory Service, stated that immigrants are "better citizens" than native Britons. Matthew Elliott of the Taxpayers' Alliance pressure group was shocked and replied that "Taxpayers shouldn't be funding an outfit that describes them as being second-rate citizens." But apparently, now they do.

How do native Brits react to this? Well, some get angry, as they should. Bryan Cork, 49, was jailed for six months for "racist slurs" after he had shouted insults at Muslim worshippers outside a Cumbria mosque, including "proud to be British" and "go back to where you came from." This was after the London Jihadist bombings in 2005. Judge Paul Batty told him that racism in any form would not be tolerated. I hear much talk about "national suicide" these days, but Mr. Cork apparently had no desire to commit national suicide, he was held down by his own authorities for refusing to accept the organized destruction of his nation. What we are dealing with here isn't suicide; it's an execution of an entire nation, perhaps an entire civilization, the greatest civilization ever created by man.

Even children face this kind of ideological intimidation. Codie Stott, a teenage British schoolgirl, was forced to spend hours in a police cell after she was reported by her teachers for "racism." She had objected, in the

mildest possible terms, to being placed during class with a group of South Asian immigrants who talked among themselves in a language she didn't understand, most likely Urdu. For this, she was dragged to the local police station and had her fingerprints taken. 18-year-old Jamie who has Down's syndrome and the mental age of a five-year-old was charged with "racism" after an argument with an immigrant. Meanwhile, the UK is being brought to its knees in an epidemic of crime and white native girls get raped by immigrants in spectacular numbers, just like all over Western Europe.

Why do people still take this lying down? I wonder about that sometimes. Maybe they feel that their votes don't matter and have resigned into a state of quiet apathy. Since many are dependent upon government support and being branded a "bigot" could cause you to lose your livelihood, people still have too much to lose by openly opposing these policies. Such subtle blackmail can be quite effective in suppressing dissent. This could, however, change rapidly in the event of a serious economic downturn. Another crucial element is confusion. People are deliberately kept in the dark by the media and the authorities regarding the full scale of what they are facing. Combined with Muslim violence and intimidation of critics, we have a climate of fear and confusion. People who are scared and confused can be easily controlled.

I've recently been re-reading the books of American evolutionary biologist Jared Diamond, especially Guns, Germs, and Steel. He has some valid points, but his most important flaw is his complete failure to explain how the Greater Middle East went from being a global center of civilization, which it was in ancient times, to being a global center of anti-civilization. This was not caused by smallpox or because zebras are more difficult to domesticate than water buffaloes. It was caused by Islam. Diamond, with his emphasis on historical materialism, fails to explain the rise of the West and especially why English, not Arabic, Chinese or Mayan, became the global lingua franca. What's so special about those rainy and foggy islands?

As Australian author Keith Windschuttle told a New Zealand audience, "The concepts of free enquiry and free expression and the right to criticise entrenched beliefs are things we take so much for granted they are almost part of the air we breathe. We need to recognise them as distinctly Western phenomena." He warns that the survival of this great achievement now depends entirely "on whether we have the intelligence to understand their true value and the will to face down their enemies."

No other civilization on earth ever created an equivalent of the European university system. One of the most important reasons why Europe surpassed China during the early modern age was more political freedom and free speech. The reason why English became the dominant language is because Britain and its offspring enjoyed great political liberty even by Western standards, and a corresponding economic dynamism. As Nathan Rosenberg and L.E. Birdzell Jr. put it in How The West Grew Rich:

"If only because colonialism has become synonymous with infamy, it is worth recalling that from the Greek colonization of the Mediterranean to the colonial ventures of the West, some colonies were immensely successful from the viewpoints of both the colony and of its country of origin. Colonialism planted the seeds for the early development of today's North and South American economies — an awesome accomplishment. But the Spanish, Portuguese, English, French, and Dutch colonial experiences and their consequences were various...By far the most striking accomplishment of British colonialism was that it seeded several advanced Western economies, to the substantial benefit of the colonies: the United States, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, Hong Kong, and Singapore. These colonies' economic accomplishments also benefited Britain, for controlled and exploitive trade with an economically backward colony is much less beneficial to an advanced country than its trade with other advanced countries. France built and lost a large colonial empire, remembered for the violent collapse of its Indo-Chinese rule and the almost equally violent end of its rule over what was probably its most economically successful colony, Algeria. In retrospect, there is little reason to think that its colonial ventures contributed positively to France's economic growth."

Probably no empire in world history has been more benevolent than the British Empire, yet a report from February 2008 recommended that patriotism should be avoided in school lessons because British history is "morally ambiguous." I suppose Islamic history isn't, with almost 1400 years of brutal Jihad warfare on several continents?

I'm sure the British are being told that the ongoing mass immigration is a result of their "colonial history." I live in a country with no colonial history, yet we are still subject to mass immigration. We are also being told that we should allow Pakistani or Nigerian flags to celebrate our Constitution Day because this will be "good

for integration.” This has nothing to do with colonialism. So what does it have to do with? Well, I’m starting to wonder whether it has something to do with the Western love affair with free speech and political liberty. Those who desire a world where society is regulated and everybody does what the authorities tell them to do fear this Western preference for political self-determination.

If we look at the West during the past thousand years, we have generally enjoyed an unusually high degree of freedom and power sharing. This has been the case more in some periods and countries than in others, but in the big scheme of things this remains true. However, although this arrangement has been good for our civilization as a whole, some of our elites apparently are jealous of the more authoritarian system in other cultures. They want to turn the West into a “normal,” meaning more corrupt and less free, civilization, aided by the forces of globalization. We are witnessing rising nepotism, and perhaps those at the top desire this.

In The Suicide of Reason: Radical Islam’s Threat to the West, Lee Harris writes that: “What strikes us as irrationalities in the economic systems of Third World nations, such as the red tape documented by [Peruvian economist Hernando] de Soto, is not irrational at all from the point of view of the dominant elite: It is part of what keeps them dominant. With enough red tape, they can stay king of the mountain forever.”

This reminds me a great deal of what Western elites are now doing, attempting to create a permanent, dominant oligarchy by keeping the native population in check through a combination of red tape and bureaucracy as well as intimidation from imported immigrants and “anti-racists.” Instead of having Western practices exported to Third World countries, Third World practices are imported to the West, along with Third World immigration.

The political elites no longer believe in stupid things such as borders, cultures and national sovereignty. Islam upsets their world-view, so they ignore it and move on with their post-national project, anyway. The most hardcore Leftists side with Islam because its hatred of the West and its concept of a global *umma* coincide with their own globalist outlook. Yes, I know that Socrates supposedly stated “I am not an Athenian or a Greek, but a citizen of the world,” but I don’t think he meant it quite as literally as Western elites do now. Socrates didn’t have an entire village of Muslims transplanted to his street during the space of a single generation.

Our traditional freedoms were the result of a specific culture, developed over centuries of hard struggles. Maybe other cultures have to go through similar struggles of their own to achieve this, and some will perhaps never be able to do so. We should protect our freedoms at home before we try to export them, and we should protect them by preserving the European-derived culture which created them.

Our enemies, internal and external, want to destroy us because we represent liberty, or at least we once did, and they want to destroy Britain in particular because it gave birth to the most powerful pro-liberty culture within the Western tradition. I hope the British can regain their strength and throw off their traitor class, but they need to do so soon. We cannot allow the greatest nation in history to be destroyed by the planet’s most barbaric cultures. The British people, like their Western counterparts elsewhere, have every right to desire self-determination and limit or completely halt immigration as they see fit to ensure this. Those who say otherwise are evil. They need to be exposed as such and removed from power.

At the same time as sharia law has gained official recognition as a part of the British legal system and Muslims proudly talk about conquering the Western world, a British woman was arrested because of a supposedly “racist” doll she kept in her window. In al-Britannia a Muslim man can claim benefits for children with multiple wives and brag about subduing the country and reducing its traditional inhabitants to second-rate citizens or worse, but you cannot have a “racially insensitive” doll in your own home, at least not if you’re white.

In a survey published in April 2008, one in three medical doctors in Britain said that elderly patients should not be given free treatment if it were unlikely to do them good for long. At the same time, Muslim men with multiple wives have been given the go-ahead to claim extra welfare benefits. Baroness Warnock, an influential government “ethical” adviser suggests that elderly dementia sufferers may have a “duty to die” because they are a financial burden to the state. Elderly Brits have to die, with or without “encouragement,” so that the state can afford to pay for all the Nigerians and Bangladeshis who flood the country. The “welfare state” now means that the natives should watch grandma die because she’s getting old anyway and we need the money to pay Muslims with multiple wives and numerous children so that they can feel comfortable while they colonize the



country.

These incidents may seem unrelated, but they are not. Make no mistake about it: Harassing the natives in order to crush them mentally and destroy any ideas they might harbor about defending their country against foreign colonization is a deliberate strategy on the part of the authorities and the ruling Multiculturalist oligarchy, whether you identify this as the British Labour Party or the European Union (both are correct). Of course, this is about the entire Western world, not just Britain, but Britain is arguably the worst example of all. I am not aware of arrests for “racist” dolls even in Sweden, Belgium or al-Canada, and they are bad cases of suicidal Multiculturalism. Britain in 2008 is no longer the nation that gave us Shakespeare, Newton or Adam Smith; it is the world’s largest open-air prison, an enlarged Marxist reeducation camp, a horror story where the authorities wage cultural and demographic warfare against the indigenous people of the country. The only good news is that I sense that native Britons are getting angrier by the day, and will not go quietly into the night.

## Will Holland Survive the 21st Century?

*This essay was first published in September 2008 at the Gates of Vienna blog, and is reproduced here with some additions.*

Let us consider the case of the Netherlands. Islamic practices there gain more and more public acceptance. There is talk of making Islamic holidays public holidays because Holland is a “Judeo-Christian-Islamic” society, whatever that is. There are plans for a Muslim-only hospital, and former Justice Minister Piet Hein Donner stated that the Dutch should give Muslims more freedoms to behave according to their traditions: “For me it is clear: if two-thirds of the Dutch population should want to introduce the Sharia tomorrow, then the possibility should exist,” according to him. “It would be a disgrace to say: ‘That is not allowed!’”

The idea is by no means far-fetched. Unofficial sharia courts have been operating for years in major European cities and gradually gain official acceptance. In September 2008 it was made known that British authorities will formally accept rulings of sharia courts on certain matters. This means that Britain has not just culturally but also legally surrendered to its new Muslim masters. The political elites will put up no resistance whatsoever to continued Islamization.

Britain is one of the worst countries in the Western world, which says a lot given how bad many others are, but it belongs to a growing group of nations where the authorities have more or less surrendered to Islamic rule, openly promote Islamic “culture”, and harass those who resist. One could add Sweden, the Netherlands, Belgium, and probably France to the list, which keeps growing. Norway, Spain, Austria, Germany and others are not far behind.

The Netherlands, which for centuries was a haven for those seeking more freedom of thought, is becoming an increasingly totalitarian society as a direct result of mass immigration in general and Muslim immigration in particular. This is the reason why the insightful Hans Janssen, Professor of Modern Islamic Ideology at Utrecht University, stated that a peaceful society that wishes to remain existent “will have to find a way to defend itself through non-peaceful means from people who are not peaceful.” According to Jansen, Muslim fundamentalists frequently make threats, but Dutch media remain silent about them.

Public broadcaster NPS is producing a television programme with the objective of giving the Dutch population a positive view of Muslims and other immigrant groups. Meanwhile, in 2008 it was revealed that a policeman of Moroccan origins in the Rotterdam police corps has been unmasked as a spy for the Moroccan intelligence service. He led a project that trained 57 Moroccan problem youngsters as ground personnel for Rotterdam Airport. The Public Prosecutor’s Office (OM) decided not to prosecute him, allegedly because this could potentially generate negative publicity about the “Multicultural” society. Even after this was revealed, the policeman unmasked as a spy for a foreign country continued working at Rotterdam Airport. The airport management saw no reason to refuse him a job.

In contrast, the Dutch Labor Party (PvdA) tried to muzzle a (then) member who was fighting for the rights of Muslim apostates because they feared he would cause the party electoral damage. As most other left-wing parties in the Western world, they get a disproportionate number of immigrant votes. The man in question, the brave ex-Muslim Ehsan Jami, in the spring of 2008 decided to close down his organization of former Muslims who defy the traditional death penalty for leaving Islam. He claims people are scared to join the organization because of threats from Muslims.

Slotervaart, a Moroccan neighborhood in Amsterdam, has been plagued by riots and arson. Just as in similar areas in Sweden, France, England and elsewhere, emergency personnel from the fire brigade and ambulance services are at risk of physical attacks when they enter. Western Europe’s major cities have become notorious for their rapidly expanding “no-go” zones, from Birmingham, London and Bradford via Marseilles, Paris, Antwerp and Brussels to Copenhagen, Berlin and Hamburg. There are now many areas into which even the police dare not venture without substantial backup. In certain urban areas the fire brigade and ambulance services are reluctant to answer calls in Muslim neighborhoods, where “youths” set fire to public buildings, and then lay an ambush for the fire brigade when it arrives.

In mid-September 2008, the bus service in the Dutch town of Gouda announced it would not drive though

the Oosterwei neighborhood. The decision came following complaints from bus drivers who report that on their route through the neighborhood they are being spit on, threatened and robbed by Moroccan youth, who systematically kick against the buses as well.

It has earlier been revealed that Moroccans, Turks and other Muslims in the Netherlands receive direction from their home countries. Ethnic Turks have received instructions from Turkey on how to vote in Dutch elections.

In mid-September 2008, politician Geert Wilders said during a speech in Parliament that Moroccans are colonizing the Netherlands. According to Wilders, Moroccans didn't come there to integrate, but "to subjugate the Dutch" and rule over them. "We lose our nation to Moroccan scum who go through life while abusing, spitting and molesting innocent people," Wilders stated. "They happily accept our dole, houses and doctors, but not our rules and values", he said. According to him there are "two nations." The cabinet's nation is that of "climate hysterics and uncontrollable Islamization." The other nation, "my nation," Geert Wilders said, "is that of the people who have to foot the bill and are being robbed and threatened by Islamic street terrorists."

Seven minutes after the speech began, "a technical error" occurred in the television broadcast which was mysteriously solved the very second Wilders finished his speech. The state TV is notoriously biased in their pro-Multicultural opinions and belief that Wilders is evil.

As I wrote in my online essay "Democracy and the Media Bias," in democratic societies the press, the Fourth Estate, should supposedly make sure that the government does its job properly as well as raise issues of public interest. In practice, we now seem to have a situation where the political elites cooperate with the media on making sure that some topics receive insufficient or unbalanced attention while others are simply kept off the agenda altogether. Together they form a new political class.

Before the rise of maverick politician Pim Fortuyn, the Dutch political scene had to a great extent been a closed club whose members, regardless of party affiliation, shared similar views in the widest possible sense. Most of the journalists belonged to the same club. If the majority of the populace didn't quite agree with this elite on sensitive issues — and the most sensitive of them all was Muslim immigration — this hardly mattered much. Since all those who were in positions of power were in basic agreement, the will of the people could safely be ignored. Journalists and rival politicians — notice how they worked in lockstep — smeared Fortuyn as a dangerous "right-wing extremist." Indirectly, this led to his murder by a left-wing activist who stated that he killed him on behalf of Muslims because he was "dangerous" to minorities.

Pim Fortuyn was indirectly murdered by the political, cultural and media elites whereas filmmaker Theo van Gogh was murdered by Muslims. MP Ayaan Hirsi Ali has been driven from the country. The Islam-critical MP Geert Wilders is still there, but he is subjected to similar smears as Fortuyn was about being a racist, receives daily threats from Muslims and not-so-subtle hints from the establishment that he should tone down his criticism of Muslim immigration. The Dutch spirit between 2001 and 2008 appears to have been broken, as things are slowly returning to normal. The extended political elites are once again firmly in control of public debate, and the embarrassing peasant rebellion has been successfully struck down. If only that Wilders person could shut his mouth...

Perhaps Holland's chance of saving itself died with Fortuyn. I hope not. I have always loved the Netherlands, and it would be extremely sad if a once-great nation that has spent so much time and energy on keeping the sea out will be destroyed by a tidal wave of sharia barbarism.

There were warning signs of these problems in the early 1990s, but the Dutch and other Westerners chose not to heed them. The case of the Danish cartoons is closely related to another Islamic assault on free speech, the death sentence given by Iranian leader the Ayatollah Khomeini to Salman Rushdie for his "blasphemous" book *The Satanic Verses* in 1989. The weak and feeble response from the West then, when Muslims "only" threatened one author and his publishers, paved the way for the situation today, when Muslims feel strong enough in the West to threaten entire countries.

A few people did understand what was going on. Several of them came from a Muslim background and understood the stakes involved. One of them was Ibn Warraq, who was inspired to write *Why I Am Not a Muslim* after the Rushdie case, but there were others. The Flemish orientalist Koenraad Elst describes how, in

Amsterdam in 1992, Mohamed Rasoel, a Pakistani immigrant, was charged with racism for his book The Downfall of the Netherlands, Land of the Naive Fools. The judge decided that Rasoel had made “unjustified generalizations” by contrasting “soft Dutchmen” with “crude, cruel, corrupt and bloodthirsty Muslims” and that it was a racist pamphlet written with the purpose of inciting hatred.

Rasoel warned in his book that the Dutch were mistaken to tolerate the mushrooming growth of their Muslim population. He predicted that this would lead to a civil war and, at best, the country’s partition. This was during the heat of the Rushdie controversy. The book was taken from the shelves in most bookstores throughout the Netherlands, and quickly forgotten about.

Mohamed Rasoel himself stated that: “It proves that the general thrust of my book is correct, that Dutch society is changing and becoming less tolerant. Freedom of opinion is already being sacrificed. I don’t blame this state attorney, he is a nice man but rather dumb and naïve like most Dutchmen...Muslims are allowed to shout: kill Rushdie...When Muslims say on TV that all Dutch women are whores, it is allowed...It is ridiculous and scandalous that I have to justify myself in court for discrimination of Muslims.”

In the book, Rasoel stated that “Being offended is sometimes purely a form of aggression.” A fitting commentary to both the Rushdie situation and the cartoon Jihad nearly a generation later. “The future is already here. The Netherlands is no longer the safe nation of the past, where a girl could walk alone through the park at night. The Dutch, and I mean those who aren’t six feet under ground already, have all in all turned into a frightened people, afraid to make jokes about Muslims, to offend them, fool them, and criticize or correct them...Dutchmen have basically been driven into a corner by the Muslims.”

Remember, this was written around 1990. And Rasoel warned that it would get much worse:

“The behavior of the Muslims currently hasn’t fully deployed yet, and can be compared to the one of the boy who is new at a club. It takes a while before the ice is broken and he starts to move more at ease, until at last his true nature becomes visible. And though the Dutch will fight for their norms and values, the Muslims will not only surprise them once again with their barbaric methods, they will punch straight through their soft and decent defense...Afterwards the Muslims will steadily continue to overmaster and dominate the Dutch, who will have no choice but to participate in a game of tug of war where they will steadily lose ground...By 2050 there will be no Netherlands left, or at least, nothing worth calling it that.”

Maybe, if the Dutch and other Westerners had been able to widely read and debate these prophetic words of Mohammed Rasoel, critics of Islam such as Pim Fortuyn and Theo van Gogh would still be alive today, and Geert Wilders, Ayaan Hirsi Ali and others would not have to live with 24 hours police protection.

American author Paul Berman in his essay/booklet Who’s Afraid of Tariq Ramadan describes the situation of Dutch-Somali former Muslim Ayaan Hirsi Ali, who now lives in the USA:

“Even in the United States she is protected by bodyguards. I happened to attend a different conference in Italy a few days earlier and met the very brave Egyptian-Italian journalist Magdi Allam, who writes scathing criticisms of the new totalitarian wave in *Il Corriere della Sera*—and I discovered that Allam, too, was traveling with a full complement of five bodyguards. The Italian journalist Fiamma Nierenstein, because of her well-known sympathies for Israel, was accompanied by her own bodyguards. So Salman Rushdie has metastasized into an entire social class, a subset of the European intelligentsia—its Muslim wing especially—who survive only because of their bodyguards and their own precautions. This is unprecedented in Western Europe during the last sixty years. And yet if someone like Pascal Bruckner mumbles a few words about the need for courage under these circumstances, the sneers begin. Today the menace to society is declared to be Hirsi Ali and people of similar minds, of whom there are quite a few: John Stuart Mill’s Muslim admirers, who are said to be just as fanatical as the fanatics. During the Rushdie affair, courage was saluted. Today it is likened to fascism.”

Censorship is spreading fast in once-tolerant the Netherlands. In May 2008 the cartoonist writing under the pseudonym Gregorius Nekschot became the first-ever cartoonist to be arrested in the modern Western world. He was arrested at his home in Amsterdam and taken into custody for interrogation, suspected of “publishing cartoons which are discriminating for Muslims and people with dark skin.” At the same time, the city of Amsterdam developed teaching material warning children against the politics of the Islam-critical politician

Geert Wilders. MP Wilders called the campaign “sickening.”

Wilders’ movie *Fitna* from March 2008 produced strong reactions from Muslims on a global basis and condemnations from dhimmi appeasers in the Western world. Although the short film didn’t do anything other than quote the Koran and statements by Muslim leaders, the United Nations Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon condemned it as offensively anti-Islamic. “There is no justification for hate speech or incitement to violence,” Ban said in a statement. “The right of free expression is not at stake here.” The UN High Commissioner for Human Rights Louise Arbour joined in on condemning the tone and content of *Fitna* and noted that the Dutch and others should prohibit any advocacy of racial or religious hatred that constitutes incitement to discrimination or hostility. In plain words, they should ban criticism of Islam.

There are already examples where small Dutch websites have been prosecuted for carrying readers’ comments critical of Islam and Muslims, thus setting a legal precedent for the suppression of free speech on the Internet. This despite the fact that far more offensive material is routinely posted on Islamic online forums and is never subjected to any punishment. Similar developments are taking place in other European countries. This is encouraged not only by national authorities but by EU officials, who have expressed their desire to “regulate” blogs and similar websites more because they are often more critical of Multiculturalism, mass immigration and general EU policies than are the mainstream media.

What this means is that Dutch authorities are giving in to demands from Islamic countries and kneel at the feet of their new Muslim masters. There can be no doubt that there is considerable political pressure on the police and others to enforce Multicultural speech codes and silence dissenters among the natives. Since we see clearly that Muslims can post negative remarks about the natives, but the natives are not allowed to post negative remarks about Islamic culture, this means that the natives are de facto second-rate citizens in their own country. This is coincidentally the status that they are supposed to have according to sharia, which means that the authorities are now enforcers of Islamic law.

Some observers say that the political elites in Western Europe are “powerless” to stop street violence. But they are aggressive in suppressing criticism of continued mass immigration, which indicates that they are not so much powerless as actively hostile to the natives.

In Brussels, Belgium, gangs of Muslim immigrants harass the natives on a daily basis. We have had several recent cases where native girls have been gang raped by immigrants in the heart of the EU capital, yet when the natives wanted to protest against the Islamization of their continent on September 11th 2007, the demonstration was banned by the Socialist mayor of Brussels, whose ruling party is heavily infiltrated by Muslims. Those who attempted to carry on with a peaceful protest were arrested by the police.

Former Belgian Prime Minister Guy Verhofstadt has said: “Belgium is the laboratory of European unification.” What kind of confidence does it inspire in citizens that their leader talks about their country as a laboratory? Are their children guinea pigs? Apparently, yes.

In 1960, 7.3% of the population of Belgian capital Brussels was non-Belgian. Today the figure is 56.5%. Jan Hertogen, a Marxist sociologist, can hardly hide his excitement over this great experiment in social engineering, and believes this population replacement “is an impressive and unique development from a European, or even a world perspective.” Yes, it is probably the first time in history that a nation demographically has handed over its capital city to outsiders without firing a single shot, but judging from trends in the rest of Europe, it won’t be the last. The European Union and the local Multicultural elites will see to that.

The courageous Flemish writer Paul Belien has argued in his book A Throne in Brussels that Belgium is used as a blueprint for the wider European Union. Belgium is an artificial state dominated by a French-speaking bureaucratic elite, and could be viewed as a laboratory for what the Eurabians want to do to the rest of the continent, such as population replacement, largely by Muslims, and silencing opposition to this by legal harassment and through various mechanisms de facto disenfranchise the native population.

The Dutch writer Margriet de Moor provides another example of why Multiculturalism is a massive experiment in social engineering, every bit as radical and dangerous as Communism. Ms. de Moor lives in some kind of alternate reality where “Europe’s affluence and free speech” will create an Islamic Reformation.



But Muslim immigration constitutes a massive drain on the former, and is slowly, but surely destroying the latter: “When I’m feeling optimistic I sometimes see the Netherlands, a small laconic country not inclined towards the large-scale or the theatrical, as a kind of laboratory on the edge of Europe. Now and then the mixture of dangerous, easily inflammable substances results in a little explosion, but basically the process of ordinary chemical reactions just continues.”

What kind of person refers to her own country as a laboratory? Ms. de Moor sounds like a scientist, dispassionately studying an interesting specimen in her microscope. I’m sure Theo van Gogh would be pleased to hear that he was basically a lab rat when he ended up with a knife in his chest for having “insulted” Islam, along with that of the “racist” Pim Fortuyn the first political murder in Holland for centuries. What was once one of the most tolerant nations in the world is now being ruined by Muslim immigration. But hey, you have to break a few eggs to make an omelet, right? These murders were an unfortunate business, no doubt, but one mustn’t call off the entire Multicultural experiment because of a few minor setbacks.

Dozens of Dutch boys and girls have been systematically abused, intimidated and molested by a group of older boys in the Utrecht neighbourhood of Overvecht. Children aged 8, 9 and 10 have been dragged into bushes and coerced into performing sexual acts on boys a few years older. Most of the children involved are of Moroccan background. A municipal council member said that the problems are not being addressed. “This has been going on for almost a year. People just talk and talk and talk. And nothing is done,” she said.

In March 2007, native Dutch residents of the city of Utrecht rioted to protest against harassment by Muslim youths and government inaction to stop this. The authorities immediately suppressed the riots by sealing off the area and installing surveillance cameras to control Dutch non-Muslims, but they have done virtually nothing to address the underlying problem of violence from immigrant gangs. The case is far from unique.

Such incidents demonstrate that the authorities throughout Western Europe are now dedicated to implementing continued mass immigration and Multiculturalism no matter what the natives think. If they object, they will be silenced. The Dutch voted “no” by a very large margin to the proposed EU Constitution that will formally dismantle their country, as did Irish and French voters, but they are simply ignored. At the same time, the EU elites obediently respond to calls from Islamic countries to ban “stereotypes and prejudice” targeting Islam. European political elites implement the agendas of our enemies and ignore the interests of their own people. They are thus collaborators and traitors and should be treated accordingly.

The interesting question is this: Are the elites merely appeasing Islam, which they certainly are doing, or are they actively promoting and expropriating it for their own ends? As Iranian ex-Muslim Ali Sina puts it in his excellent book Understanding Muhammad: “Islam was an instrument of domination. After Muhammad, others used his cult for the very same purpose.” Maybe this is happening in the EU as well?

Sina rejects the Multicultural concept that all cultures (except European culture, which is evil and should be eradicated) are worth keeping:

“If any culture needs to be preserved, it is the Western, Hellenic-Christian culture. It is this culture that is facing extinction. It is to this culture alone that we owe the Enlightenment, Renaissance, and democracy. These are the foundations of our modern world. It would be a terrible mistake not to preserve this culture. If we do nothing, we face a future where democracy and tolerance will fade and Islam’s more primitive instincts will subjugate humanity. All cultures are not made equal... Islam is not a culture. It is the antithesis of culture. It is barbarity, savagery and incivility. Islamic civilization is an oxymoron, while Islamic terrorism is redundancy. We owe our freedom and modern civilization to Western culture. It is this culture that is now under attack and needs protection.”

It is not Political Correctness to say that in some cases it’s actually people from an immigrant background, people who were not born into the West such as Ibn Warraq, Ali Sina and Wafa Sultan, who are at the forefront of defending free speech in Western countries, while many white Marxists want to silence free speech as “racism” and actively embrace Islam. We thus have a highly unusual situation — possibly unique — where some of the people who were born into a civilization attack it from within whereas others who were not born into it defend it.

As I put it in my essay “The Welfare State is Dead, Long Live the Welfare State,” Americans say “In God we

trust.” Is the welfare state, on some deep, subconscious level, a substitute for God? An omnipresent State instead of an omnipresent God? Europeans lost belief in God in Auschwitz and the trenches of WW1. We no longer trust in God, so we put our trust in the State, to create a small oasis of security on a continent that has had such a turbulent history.

The slogan is “security from cradle to grave.” But right now the welfare state clearly does not provide financial or physical security in much of Western Europe, at least not for the natives. It pays for more cradles to Muslim immigrants while it leads some of the natives prematurely to their graves. Taxes are a form of disguised *jizya*, the poll tax paid by submissive non-Muslims under Islamic rule, taken from us and given to those who colonize our lands.

The welfare state breeds passivity and obedience to the state’s agenda since so many are dependent upon it for their livelihoods. For rulers, this can be quite useful. The stated purpose of the welfare state is to alleviate poverty, but we should remember that a powerful state bureaucracy which deals with all aspects of life leaves a great deal of power to those on top of that bureaucracy, ruling people who have been pacified and emasculated by decades of state indoctrination and interference in their private lives. I suspect one of the reasons why Europeans put up with a powerful EU bureaucracy running much of Europe’s affairs is that we have already been accustomed to this on a national level.

My advice to Westerners in general is to arm themselves immediately, first of all mentally with knowledge of the enemy and pride in their own culture and heritage, but also physically with guns and the skills to use them. Friedrich Nietzsche stated in the nineteenth century that “God is dead.” In the early twenty-first century it would be fair to say that “The State is dead,” the replacement God in which we placed our trust after the other God died.

Every single day we get more evidence that the authorities are totally incapable of protecting any semblance of security and freedom for its citizens. The only thing the state still seems to be capable of doing is indoctrinating our children with hatred of their own civilization and taking away our money so that it can be given to those who colonize our countries and abuse our children, verbally and physically.

My bet is still on Britain, or possibly Denmark, as the first Western country to face a civil war due to mass immigration, but the Netherlands is a potential candidate as well. I just wonder whether the Dutch are already a broken nation. Their political elites have chosen surrender and will enforce sharia and ban everybody disagreeing with this as “extremists.” Native Dutchmen will either have to fight back or leave their country behind and watch it die from a distance. A significant number of them have chosen the latter option. In 2008, the Netherlands is the only Western European country experiencing net emigration, although similar trends are visible in the UK and to lesser extent other countries. It’s the best and brightest among the natives that are leaving, in exchange for low-skilled immigrants from developing countries.

What is happening in Western Europe now is a textbook case of a situation where the social contract is no longer upheld. The natives pay extremely high tax rates to nation states that no longer protect their borders and are both unwilling and incapable of upholding a bare minimum of law and order. The laws are in any case no longer passed with our interest in mind, but by dedicated Multiculturalists and Globalists specifically hostile to our interests. The European Union is the very definition of tyranny.

As John Locke says in the *Second Treatise on Government*:

“The reason why men enter into society is the preservation of their property, and the end why they choose and authorize a legislative is that there may be laws made, and rules set, as guards and fences to the properties of all the members of the society, to limit the power and moderate the dominion of every part and member of the society... whenever the legislators endeavor to take away and destroy the property of the people, or to reduce them to slavery under arbitrary power, they put themselves into a state of war with the people... By this breach of trust they forfeit the power the people had put into their hands for quite contrary ends, and it devolves to the people, who have a right to resume their original liberty, and, by the establishment of a new legislative, (such as they shall think fit) provide for their own safety and security, which is the end for which they are in society.”

Thomas Jefferson stated that “I hold it, that a little rebellion, now and then, is a good thing, and as necessary

in the political world as storms in the physical.” He also said that “Laws that forbid the carrying of arms... disarm only those who are neither inclined nor determined to commit crimes... Such laws make things worse for the assaulted and better for the assailants; they serve rather to encourage than to prevent homicides, for an unarmed man may be attacked with greater confidence than an armed man.”

We would do well to heed those words.

## A Tribute to Italy

*This essay was first published at the Gates of Vienna blog in July 2008. It is republished here with some changes and additions, among them quotes taken from the essay Why Western Art is Unique, and Why Muslim Immigration Threatens It at The Brussels Journal.*

In 2008, after the center-right government of Silvio Berlusconi gained power in Italy, Spain's vice-president Maria Teresa Fernandez de la Vega accused the Italians of racism. "The [Spanish] government rejects violence, racism and xenophobia, thus it does not agree with what is happening in Italy," said Fernandez de la Vega. Human rights organizations such as Amnesty International warned that the new immigration restrictions were part of a worrying trend, and that Italian politicians were legitimizing the use of "racist language." Later, the president of the city of Milan, Filippo Penati, proposed to fine Muslims who pray on the streets or sidewalks outside of the local mosque because they create obstacles for others.

"For some time Italy has been the gateway of the Mediterranean, but this door now needs to be slammed shut because we have a duty to defend our citizens and guarantee their safety" said Italy's Minister for Community Policies, Andrea Ronchi. "We shall punish illegal immigrants, irregular stays by foreigners who commit crimes on our territory. And this is our full right as a nation."

Is it? In the view of various "human rights" organizations, European countries do not have the right to defend our borders or citizens. That would violate the "human rights" of those who colonize our countries and harass our children in the streets of our cities. We're viewed as a big, fat and stupid cow whose only reason to exist apparently is to be milked by others. Or worse, we have a duty to die, to dismantle our nations and applaud our annihilation.

According to a survey from April 2008 funded by the Facility for Euro-Mediterranean Investment and Partnership (FEMIP), the funds transferred from Europe to eight southern Mediterranean countries (Algeria, Egypt, Jordan, Lebanon, Morocco, Syria, Tunisia and Turkey) represent between 2% and 20% of the gross domestic product of these countries. The incomes received by immigrants and then sent to their countries of origin are a resource on which the governments in the Arab and Muslim world are becoming increasingly dependant. The European Union wants this trend to continue and expand, and Muslims will intimidate anybody who challenges these pro-Arab policies.

In May 2008, Libya threatened "catastrophic repercussions to her relations with Italy" if Roberto Calderoli was once again appointed minister. The threat came from the son of leader Muammar Gheddafi, Saif El Islam, who thundered against the Northern League representative. As Minister of Reforms in 2006, reminded a note from the Rome office of the Libyan news agency, Calderoli in the course of a TV interview had showed a T-shirt "with offensive drawings against Islam" (one of the Danish Muhammad cartoons), a gesture which sparked protests with hundreds of angry demonstrators attacking the Italian consulate in the Libyan city of Bengasi. The final toll of the bitter clashes with the police forces which had been marshalled to protect the consulate was 11 dead and 35 wounded.

It is highly revealing how, whenever a Western country appears to be serious about restricting mass immigration, human rights organizations, various international NGOs, UN and EU agencies as well as some national governments will make common cause with immigrant groups in exerting pressure on this country to abandon its defenses in the name of "human rights, international law, tolerance and anti-racism."

I have my issues with Mr. Berlusconi, but whatever his other faults, he is not a dhimmi. His predecessor, the Socialist PM and former EUocrat Romano Prodi, who was in the process of turning Italy into a leader of the Axis of Appeasement together with his Spanish colleague Zapatero, is a passionate cheerleader of Eurabia. Muslims see the distinction, too.

In June 2008, Prime Minister Silvio Berlusconi and prominent Italian journalist Magdi Allam, an Egyptian-born former Muslim who converted to Christianity in 2008, were the targets of death threats posted on a popular Islamic website said to be close to the Jihadist organization al-Qaeda. In an article in the *Corriere della Sera*, Allam stated that we cannot allow reality to be determined by the negators of Jihad, the deniers of Israel or the apologists for Palestinian terrorism. He warned against granting legitimacy to Al-Azhar in Egypt,

the most prestigious institution for sharia scholars and religious matters in the Sunni Islamic world:

“Let it be clearly understood, once and for all, that Al Azhar is a fortress of Muslim extremism and of Muslim terrorism. Let the Minister of the Interior send back to their countries of origin those Imams who are submissive adherents of this ideology. Let the Minister of Foreign Affairs clearly denounce the agreement of cooperation signed on June 15, 2005, between Al Azhar and five Italian universities, signed by Ambassador Antonio Badini with the rector of Al Azhar, Sheikh Ahmad al Tayyeb, who on April 4, 2002 said: ‘The solution to Israeli terror can be found in suicide attacks that will sow terror in the hearts of the enemies of Islam.’ Let everyone stop legitimizing the ideologues of the Muslim Brotherhood, beginning with Tariq Ramadan. Let the state, and local institutions, stop handing over the mosques to UCOII. The lesson we must all learn from the latest scandal emanating from the Grand Mosque of Rome, is that before accrediting any Muslim as an official interlocutor, it is necessary to make him subscribe to a declaration in which he publicly recognizes the right of Israel to exist and condemns unequivocally Palestinian terrorism.”

There are some encouraging signs of resistance in Italy. What is so special about this country? I have heard suggestions that political correctness and self-loathing is a “Protestant disease” and that Catholic countries are less prone to contracting it. I am willing to consider that possibility, but I haven’t seen any convincing evidence for it so far.

I cannot give a good explanation as to why Lutheran Denmark is stronger than Norway, Finland, and Sweden, culturally speaking closely related nations. I suspect one of the causes is that Denmark has enjoyed a healthier culture of debate and tolerance for public dissent than Norway or Finland, with Sweden being a particularly nasty example of the long-term effects of ideological indoctrination and suppression of dissent. Although very far from being a paradise, tiny Denmark has a genuine debate about immigration that would be respectable for a much larger country. Britain is more than ten times as large, yet is currently one of the worst nations in the Western world. Exactly why, I don’t know. It is possible that they have particularly treasonous political elites, but I do suspect that the British, the source of the first truly global lingua franca, suffer from a post-Imperial Stress Syndrome.

Possibly the worst country in Europe, demographically speaking, is France. The French Revolution made France into a culturally wounded nation, and the legacy of French rule in North Africa and Syria has left the French with the illusion that they “understand” Arabs and Muslims, and now want to use them as a tool to prevent France’s long-term decline into irrelevance as a Great Power. Sadly, the French try to export their self-destructive ideologies to other countries through the European Union.

Among the larger countries in Western Europe, Italy currently ranks as the healthiest one, if we ignore the appallingly low birth rates it shares with the rest of Europe. I am disappointed with the Spanish. Maybe they, too, suffer from a post-Imperial Stress Syndrome, just like the British and the French. I hope the Germans will wake up and smell the coffee; they have no obligation to surrender their great country to vastly inferior cultures, but they may be too weighed down by their recent history to play a leading role in the European resistance just yet.

Why Italians are more resistant to colonization through mass immigration is uncertain, but they are. One cause is certainly the legacy of the great journalist and writer Oriana Fallaci, who during the final years of her life did more to wake people up to the Islamic threat than perhaps any other individual in the entire Western world.

In [The Force of Reason](#), [Oriana Fallaci](#) recalls how, in 1972, she interviewed the Palestinian terrorist George Habash, who told her that the Palestinian problem was about far more than Israel. The Arab goal, Habash declared, was to wage war “against Europe and America” and to ensure that henceforth “there would be no peace for the West.” The Arabs, he informed her, would “advance step by step. Millimeter by millimeter. Year after year. Decade after decade. Determined, stubborn, patient. This is our strategy. A strategy that we shall expand throughout the whole planet.” Fallaci thought he was referring simply to terrorism. Only later did she realize that he “also meant the cultural war, the demographic war, the religious war waged by stealing a country from its citizens.”

A single Italian city such as Venice or Florence contains more great works of art and architecture than has been produced in the entire Islamic world during 1400 years. Even their critics will not deny that Italians have



a love for art and design, for food, wine and for enjoying life. After reading the history of science and technology, my impression is that their contributions to commerce and science, too, are sometimes underrated. In southern Europe, Italians, in my view, outperformed the Spanish in science despite the fact that the latter held extensive colonies for centuries whereas the Italians did not. The commercial revolution which created the seeds for Western capitalism took place in the Italian city-states.

It has become customary to attribute the birth of modern European science to the legacy of “Arabic and Islamic science,” whatever that is. Yet the Renaissance took place in northern Italy, which had extensive contacts with the Byzantine Empire. Likewise, it is common to attribute the major breakthroughs in Western Europe to the surpluses generated by “colonialism.” However, in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, the Germans outperformed the French and often the British in technological ingenuity, despite the fact that the latter ruled much of the world whereas the Germans held only marginal colonies.

Both Italians and non-Italians often make jokes about Italian bureaucracy or lack of such. Italy is definitely a less “efficient,” in the meaning of “bureaucratically organized,” country than, say, Britain or Sweden, but these are hardly nations to emulate today. Contemporary Britain makes George Orwell’s *1984* look tame.

Throughout much of the Western world, the state-sponsored bureaucracy is no longer there to look after our interests; it is there to force us to surrender our countries to aliens in the name of ideologies promoted by unaccountable transnational organs which do not have our interests in mind. In this situation, reluctance to allow faceless bureaucrats to run your life is a blessing, not a curse, and the ingrained Italian distrust of bureaucrats is one of the reasons why Italy is among the leading Western European nations in resisting cultural surrender.

Italians still love their culture, as they should, and have no intention of surrendering it to anybody. It is inconceivable to write European history from the Roman Empire until today and leave out the massive Italian contributions. Those visiting Rome will be struck by the immense visual power of its buildings, paintings and monuments, stretching back hundreds and in many cases thousands of years. The long-term survival of these invaluable monuments is directly threatened by Muslim immigration.

Raphael Israeli, professor of Islamic, Middle Eastern and Chinese history at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem, Israel, is the author of numerous books. In [The Islamic Challenge in Europe](#), he describes how hostile Muslims in Italy behave against the country’s cultural treasures, a phenomenon which enraged Oriana Fallaci:

“Some years back, when Europe was still complacent about Muslim immigration, a famous Italian film director gave an interview to a major Italian daily where he deplored the outrageous conduct of the immigrants. He particularly lamented the fact that every Friday, a Muslim crowd squatted in front of one of the most celebrated cathedrals of Europe in Florence, to perform their Friday prayer. As a liberal, he certainly could not deny Muslims their right to freedom of worship, but at the risk of being labeled ‘racist,’ he courageously stated the obvious when he asked ‘why do the Muslims come to this particular spot,’ sometimes from their far-away suburbs, just in order to state their challenge to the Christian symbol. The Muslims have their places of worship, even in the very heart of Rome the capital and no one interferes with them, so why did they need to provoke their Christian hosts?”

Muslims are at best indifferent towards non-Muslim cultures, past or present, at worst actively hostile to them. Saladin, the twelfth century general loved by Muslims for his victories against the Crusaders, is renowned even in Western history for his supposedly tolerant nature. Very few seem to remember that his son Al-Aziz Uthman, who was presumably influenced by his father’s religious convictions, tried to demolish the Great Pyramids of Giza, Egypt, only three years after his father’s death in 1193. The reason why we can still visit them today is because the task at hand was so big that he eventually gave up the attempt. He did, however, manage to inflict visible damage to Menkaure’s Pyramid, the smallest of the three large pyramids at Giza. It is tempting to view this as a continuation of his father’s Jihad against non-Muslims:

“When king Al-Aziz Othman, son of [Saladin] succeeded his father, he let himself be persuaded by some people from his Court, who were devoid of good sense, to demolish the pyramids. One started with the red pyramid, which is the third of the great pyramids, and the smallest....They brought there a large number of workmen from all around, and supported them at great cost. They stayed there for eight whole months...This

happened in the year 593 [i.e. 1196 AD].” (transl. SACY, Description de l’Egypte IX, 468)

The legend that the missing nose of the Great Sphinx at Giza was removed by Napoléon Bonaparte’s artillery during the French expedition to Egypt 1798-1801 is incorrect. Sketches indicate that the nose was gone long before this. The Egyptian fifteenth century historian al-Maqrizi attributes the act to Muhammad Sa’im al-Dahr, a Sufi Muslim. According to al-Maqrizi, in the fourteenth century, upon discovering that local peasants made offerings to the Sphinx, al-Dahr became furious at their idolatry and decided to destroy the statue, managing only to break off its nose. It is hard to confirm whether this story is accurate, but if it is, it demonstrates that Sufis are not always the soft and tolerant Muslims they are made out to be.

Far from damaging the Sphinx, the French brought scientists to catalogue the ancient monuments, thus founding modern Egyptology. The trilingual Rosetta Stone, discovered in 1799, was employed by philologist Jean-François Champollion to decipher the Egyptian hieroglyphs in 1822. In this task, he made extensive use of the Coptic language. Arab Muslims had controlled Egypt for more than a thousand years, yet never managed to decipher the hieroglyphs nor for the most part displayed much interest in doing so. Europeans did so in a single generation after they reappeared in force in Egypt. So much for “Arab science.” And they did so with the help of the language of the Copts, the Egyptian Christians, one of the few remnants of ancient Egypt that the Arab invaders hadn’t managed to completely eradicate.

Sita Ram Goel and other writers have tracked the destruction of numerous pre-Islamic temples in India in the book Hindu Temples — What Happened to Them. Infidels would be well-advised not to believe that such cultural Jihad is a thing of the past. Within a few years, thousands of churches have been destroyed in Indonesia, and many more Serb Orthodox churches and monasteries have been damaged by Muslims in Kosovo and Bosnia. An attack on statues at a museum in Cairo by a veiled woman screaming, “Infidels, infidels!” shocked the outside world. She had been inspired by Grand Mufti Ali Gomaa, who quoted a saying of Muhammad that sculptors will be among those receiving the harshest punishment on Judgment Day. The influential Yusuf al-Qaradawi agreed that “Islam prohibits statues and three-dimensional figures of living creatures” and concluded that “the statues of ancient Egyptians are prohibited.”

The great Bamiyan Buddhas in Afghanistan were demolished by the Taliban regime in 2001, who decreed that they would destroy images deemed “offensive to Islam.” The Taliban Information Minister complained that “The destruction work is not as easy as people would think. You can’t knock down the statues by dynamite or shelling as both of them have been carved in a cliff. They are firmly attached to the mountain.” The statues, 53 meters and 36 meters tall, the tallest standing Buddha statues in the world, turned out to be so hard to destroy that the Taliban needed help from Pakistani and Saudi engineers to finish the job. Finally, after almost a month of non-stop bombardment with dynamite and artillery, they succeeded.

Judging from the experiences with the Bamiyan Buddhas, it is tempting to conclude that the only reason why the pyramids of Egypt have survived to this day is because they were so big that it proved too complicated, costly and time-consuming for Muslims to destroy them. Had Saladin’s son Al-Aziz had modern technology and engineers at his disposal, they might well have ended up like countless Hindu temples in India or Buddhist statues in Central Asia.

As a European, I fear for the future of the Louvre in Paris, the National Gallery in London, the Rijksmuseum in Amsterdam and Michelangelo’s paintings in the Sistine Chapel in Rome. There is every reason to believe that they will end up the same way as the Bamiyan Buddhas. Although it may not happen today, tomorrow or even the day after tomorrow, sooner or later, pious Muslims will destroy these priceless works of art and consider it their sacred duty. Muslim immigration threatens many of the masterworks of the Western tradition of art, the most inventive and groundbreaking mankind has ever seen, with annihilation. History will never forgive us for our cowardice and stupidity if we allow these treasures to be destroyed just because we think history is boring or don’t want to say anything unfashionable about other cultures.

The official reason given by Muslims for why non-Muslims are not allowed to visit the cities of Mecca and Medina is because they might damage or destroy the Islamic Holy Sites. But since Muslims have a proven track record through more than a thousand years, from Malaysia to Armenia, of destroying non-Muslim places of worship and works of art, perhaps we should then, in return, be entitled to keep Muslims permanently away from our cultural treasures? Italians and others should heed this warning.

Italy is by no means immune to the problems affecting the Western world, but her odds are better than those of several other nations. Through contact with Italians, I gain the impression of a country whose national heart is still beating, a people who are still in touch with their roots and believe that their national survival is desirable. This is no mean feat given the suicidal state of our civilization in this age. When observing Italy, I see sickness but also life; and where there is life, there is hope. Something tells me that the story of Italy as a vibrant heartland of European civilization still contains more chapters to be written. If we are lucky, her struggle for survival and rebirth can inspire others beyond her borders.

## France: Can a Wounded Nation Heal Itself?

*This essay was first published at The Brussels Journal in August 2008. It is adopted here with some additions, especially from two essays from 2006, The Fall of France and the Multicultural World War and Beheading Nations: The Islamization of Europe's Cities.*

Here is a quote by Nicolas Sarkozy from 2006, before he became French President:

“[S]ecurity is the responsibility of the State, I am against militias, I am against the private ownership of firearms, and I’m trying to make you think about that. If you are assaulted by an armed burglar, he’ll use his weapon more effectively than you anyway so you’re risking your life. If the criminal is not armed and you are and you shoot, your life will be ruined, because killing someone over a theft is not in line with the republican values that are mine. The private ownership of firearms is dangerous. I understand your exasperation for having been burglarized two times, I understand the fear that your wife and daughter may have but the answer is in the efficiency of the police and the efficiency of the judiciary process, the answer is not in having guns at home.”

Yes, but what happens when the state neither can nor wants to protect its citizens, which is clearly the case in France and in many other Western countries today? Here is another quote by the same man, this time as president, in July 2008, when he announced the creation of a new “Mediterranean Union” in a huge meeting between European and Arab leaders: “*The goal of this summit for the Mediterranean, of this Union for the Mediterranean, is that we learn to love each other instead of continuing to hate each other and wage war,*” Sarkozy told a news conference. That same month he also declared that Ireland will have to hold a second referendum after Irish voters rejected the EU Constitution, the same Constitution which French and Dutch voters had previously rejected but which was implemented anyway under another name, the Lisbon Treaty. In saner times we would have called this a coup d’état, committed not just in one country but in many countries simultaneously.

The European Union is an organization of corrupt parasites and power-grabbing traitors, mixed up with some dangerously naive fools. EU leaders are intent on flooding their countries with even more Muslims at the same time as immigrants commit countless acts of violence against native Europeans. The greatest organized betrayal in history is celebrated as a victory for peace and tolerance. Our so-called leaders open the floodgates to people who are, always have been, and always will be hostile to everything we hold dear, and tell us to love them. Unfortunately, others have rather different plans for us.

Iranian writer Amir Taheri explains how al Qaeda’s chief theoretician, Sheik Abu-Bakar Naji, in his new book *Governance in the Wilderness* suggests that low-intensity war should be extended to anywhere in the world with a significant Muslim presence, creating parallel societies resembling “liberated zones” set up by Marxist guerrillas in parts of Latin America in the twentieth century. The Jihadis are to begin by giving areas where Muslims live a distinctly Islamic appearance, by imposing special styles of dress for women and beards for men. Then they start imposing Islamic law. In the final phase, they should create a parallel system of taxation and law enforcement. This is already being implemented in many European urban areas.

Sheik Abu-Bakar Naji recommends that Islamic Jihad should be everywhere, with “countless small operations” that render daily life unbearable for the infidels, who, when leaving their homes every morning, should be unsure whether they’ll return in the evening. Naji recommends kidnappings, exhibition killings to terrorize the enemy, suicide bombings and countless gestures that make a normal life impossible. Once parallel societies are established throughout the world, they would exert pressure on non-Muslims to submit. Naji believes that, subjected to constant intimidation and fear of death, most non-Muslims would submit because “The West has no stomach for a long fight.”

While Islamic theoreticians are making long-term plans for how best to terrorize our children and destroy our societies, the EU is opening up for more Muslim immigration and banning opposition to this as “racism.” The only possible conclusion native Europeans can draw from this is that our so-called leaders are now either outright enemies or reduced to obedient puppets for those who are our enemies. So no, Mr. Sarkozy, we should no longer expect the state to protect our security. We need to take care of that ourselves. How? Well, by adopting a second amendment everywhere in Europe as soon as possible, but also by arming ourselves with

real knowledge of our history and the achievements of our ancestors, rather than the hostile propaganda passing for “truth” we are being spoon-fed in the media and the education system these days.

In July 2008, President Nicolas Sarkozy, while laying the foundation stone of new rooms for the Arts of Islam at the Louvre in Paris, stated that “*France is a friend of Arab countries. Islam is the bearer of one of the oldest and most prestigious civilizations in the world,*” and the new exhibition is “*an opportunity for the French and all visitors to the Louvre to see that Islam is progress, science, refinement, modernity.*” Prince Alwalid Bin Talal Bin Abdulaziz Al Saud of Saudi Arabia, King Abdullah’s nephew, is an important donor to the project. “*France wants peace, France does not want the clash of civilizations between East and West,*” said the French president. “*France says to the Arab countries that it will help them acquire the energy of the future, nuclear energy used for peaceful civilian purposes.*”

So, France wants peace, and since we all know that Islam is peace, does that mean that France wants Islam? Probably not all the French, but their political elites certainly seem to want it or else have resigned themselves to that prospect.

I like many aspects of French culture, but I admit I deeply distrust modern French political culture. At least since the late eighteenth century, France has been stuck in a pattern with shifts between an incredibly elitist political class, violent upheavals and Utopian ideologies. Frankly, one of the most disturbing things about the EU is that it exports this unhealthy bureaucratic and political culture to the rest of the continent. There is no doubt that France is disproportionately responsible for the mess much of Europe is in now. The EU was a French idea, and so was Eurabia. Both have been viewed as tools to promote otherwise declining French influence on the international arena.

Several prominent French leaders stated in 2005 that the proposed EU Constitution (largely written by a former French President) was basically an enlarged France. Justice Minister Dominique Perben said: “We have finally obtained this ‘Europe à la française’ that we have awaited for so long. This constitutional treaty is an enlarged France. It is a Europe written in French.” Education Minister François Fillon stated: “This Constitution allows the French ambition to assert itself in the big Europe that General de Gaulle hoped and prayed for.”

But with burning cars, hundreds of de facto Islamic mini-states in the heart of France and notoriously arrogant political elites hell-bent on importing even more Muslims, exactly why should other Europeans want to live in an enlarged France? The country is currently set on a path to cultural suicide and has a worse demographic profile than any other Western European nation.

Things went seriously wrong with Europe starting with World War I in 1914, which radicalized the continent, paved the way for the totalitarian states of Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union and in the long run perhaps the European Union. But you could argue successfully that some of the seeds of our current problems were planted as far back as in 1789. In my book, the French Revolution is one of the worst disasters ever to befall this continent, and I simply cannot understand why so many people celebrate it as something positive. France is a wounded nation, a nation that worships its wounds and wants everybody else to share them, too. Until a sound and healthy French culture has been restored, if that is indeed still possible, others should forcefully reject any claims to French moral or intellectual leadership.

That being said, there are still many good people left in France, but they fight with tremendous odds against them. I do not speak any of the Romance languages, and I regret that sometimes. The French professor of medieval history Sylvain Gouguenheim recently published a book entitled Aristote au Mont Saint-Michel: Les Racines Grecques de l’Europe (Aristotle at Mont Saint-Michel: The Greek Roots of Europe). It looks interesting and right down my alley, but I cannot read it until it has been translated into English.

Gouguenheim said it was in light of a 2002 recommendation from the European Union that schoolbooks give a more positive rendering of Islam’s part in European heritage “that an attempt at a clarification becomes necessary.” He makes the case that Islam was impermeable to much of Greek thought, that the Arab world’s initial translations of it to Latin were not so much the work of “Islam” but of Middle Eastern Christians, and that a wave of translations of Aristotle began at the Mont Saint-Michel monastery in France 50 years before Arab versions of the same texts appeared in Islamic-occupied Spain.



Aristotle's works on ethics, metaphysics and politics were disregarded by the Muslim world because they were viewed as incompatible with the Koran. Europeans, he says, "became aware of the Greek texts because it went hunting for them, not because they were brought to them." Gouguenheim calls the Mont Saint-Michel monastery, where texts were translated into Latin, "the missing link in the passage from the Greek to the Latin world of Aristotelian philosophy." Outside of a few thinkers — he lists Al-Farabi, Avicenna, Abu Ma'shar and Averroes — Gouguenheim considers that the "masters of the Middle East" retained from the ancient Greeks only what they considered to be compatible with the Koran.

The notion that the West "owes" its progress to medieval translations of "Islamic science," which Mr. Gouguenheim criticizes, is the official ideology of the European Union. The fact that he receives powerful opposition when questioning it is not accidental. The ridiculous concept that we have a "shared" cultural tradition with Muslims is being propagated by all EU organs in close cooperation with Islamic countries. Pro-Islamic Multiculturalism is the ruling ideology of the EUSSR, just like Communism was the ruling ideology of the USSR and its satellite nations. Questioning it is a thought crime.

In The Great Divergence: China, Europe, and the Making of the Modern World Economy, scholar Kenneth Pomeranz claims that several Asian countries, especially China, were at least as advanced as Europe as late as the early nineteenth century. Europe didn't diverge critically from Asia until then, and the Industrial Revolution started in Britain in part due to a geographical accident because they had easy access to coal, and in part due to overseas colonies and markets. It didn't have anything much to do with superior science or technology.

The Chinese did have the world's largest economy for a long time (and may well have so again later this century). They have always been good at engineering and applied technology, but weaker in the mathematical sciences and in scientific theory. As late as the seventeenth century AD, there was a consensus among Chinese scholars that the earth is flat. This didn't change until they were confronted with European astronomical and geographical knowledge by Jesuit missionaries. By that time, Europeans had known that the earth is spherical for two thousand years. The idea that educated medieval Europeans believed in a flat earth is a myth.

In Genghis Khan and the Making of the Modern World, a largely — and in my view excessively — pro-Mongol book, Jack Weatherford claims that the Mongol conquests in the thirteenth century triggered the Renaissance in Europe by opening up the continent to ideas from Asia, for instance gunpowder and printing. So, we now have claims that the Renaissance was what caused the great advances in Western science, and that it was triggered by Muslims in the twelfth century or Mongols in the thirteenth century. At the same time, there was supposedly nothing special about Europe until the late eighteenth or early nineteenth centuries.

An intelligent reader will quickly see that all of these different claims cannot be true at the same time, yet they are all made at the same time. The point here is not whether any of them are correct, the point is to put down any sense of pride people of European origins might have in their historical achievements. It is a bit ironic that European culture is constantly derided for being racist, oppressive and evil, yet everybody else seems very busy with claiming the honor for having created it. If we are racist oppressors who rape the earth and create global warming, why are Muslims and others so eager to take credit for having created our culture? Shouldn't they feel ashamed of themselves instead?

The truth is that the scientific revolution was the greatest achievement of the human mind in history, and it was done by Europeans, not by anybody else. This particular form of ideological disinformation takes place all over the Western world, and there is no specific reason for singling out the French in this regard. I suspect many ordinary French citizens are just as fed-up with this nonsense as everybody else is. I wish good French people the best of luck in reclaiming their dignity and their country. Given the state of things, they are going to need it.

What about basing French national identity on the Battle of Tours on October 10, 732, when the people who were eventually known as the French halted an Islamic invasion of the heartland of the European continent? By doing so, they saved not only their own nation; they saved the greatest civilization mankind has ever seen. That really is something to celebrate, unlike the happenings of 1789 which led to senseless mass slaughter and widespread intra-European wars. If the French need historical inspiration, they should follow the example of the right Charles next time. That would be Martel, not de Gaulle.

As I warned in the essay *The Fall of France and the Multicultural World* from 2006, French Jews are leaving the country in ever-growing numbers, fleeing a wave of anti-Semitism. Hundreds of ghettos are already de facto following sharia, not French law. The French military are not always squeamish, but there are estimates that 15% of the armed forces are already made up of Muslims, and rising. How effective can the army then be in upholding the French republic? At the same time, opinion polls show that the French are now officially the most anti-capitalist nation on earth. France has chosen Socialism and Islam. It will get both, and sink into a quagmire of its own making.

Some believe France will quietly become a Muslim country, others believe in civil war in the near future. I'm not sure which of these scenarios is scarier. People keep talking about the nuclear weapons that the Islamic Republic of Iran may soon have, and that is indeed worrisome, but what about the hundreds of nuclear warheads the French have? How do we handle an Islamic France, still the heartland of the European continent, with Muslim control of hundreds of nukes? And how do we handle a Bosnia or Lebanon with a population much larger than either of these countries, and with hundreds of nuclear warheads at stake?

If Muslim immigration continues, the impending fall of France could mark the starting point of the Balkanization of much of Europe, perhaps even North America. I fear this is a world war. Maybe future historians will dub it the Multicultural World War. I find this to be more accurate than "The Islamic World War" because what will cause this world war is Western cultural weakness rather than Islamic strength. This world war may very well be in the form of a global civil war, where you get a string of violent collapses instead of countries invading other countries. Multiculturalism and uncontrolled mass-immigration destroy the internal cohesion of the decadent West, which will slowly fall apart as it has lost the will to defend itself and the belief in its own culture. The wars in the Balkans in the 1990s will in hindsight be seen as a prelude to the Multicultural World War. Rather than a Westernization of the Balkans, we could get a Balkanization of the West.

Although France is one of the worst countries, it is by no means the only one in trouble. As I stated in my essay *Beheading Nations: The Islamization of Europe's Cities* from 2006, we have seen videos on TV of Muslim Jihadists beheading infidel hostages. Less attention has been paid to the fact that Muslims are beheading entire nation states. Although this is happening in slow motion, it is no less dramatic. Historically, the major cities have constituted a country's "head," the seat of most of its political institutions and the largest concentration of its cultural brainpower. What happens when this "head" is cut off from the rest of the body?

In many countries across Western Europe, immigrants tend to settle in major cities, with the native population retreating to minor cities or into the countryside. Previously, Europeans or non-Europeans could travel between countries and visit new cities, each with its own, distinctive character and peculiarities. Soon, you will travel from London to Paris or Amsterdam and find that you have left one city dominated by burkas and sharia to find... yet another city dominated by burkas and sharia. For some reason, this eradication of unique, urban cultures is celebrated as "cultural diversity."

In France, Muslims already have many smaller states within the state. Criminologist Lucienne Bui Trong wrote that: "From 106 hot points in 1991, we went to 818 sensitive areas in 1999." The term she used, "sensitive areas," was used to describe Muslim no-go zones where anything representing a Western institution (post office truck, firemen, even mail order delivery firms) was routinely ambushed with Molotov cocktails. The number was 818 in 2002, when the French government decided to stop collecting the statistics.

Famed Sociologist Max Weber has defined a state as an entity with a "monopoly on the legitimate use of physical force within a given territory." Since hundreds of ghettos in France (and elsewhere) are already outside of police control and effectively under the rule of local militias, hasn't France already ceased being a functioning state?

In some of these areas, the phenomenon of gang rape "has become banal." Violence against and pressure on women is part of daily life in the suburbs, where boys can dictate how girls should dress. Pressure is mounting for Muslim women to wear veils. In 2002, a 17-year-old girl was set alight by an 18-year-old boy as his friends stood by. The support group "*Ni Putes, Ni Soumises*" ("Neither Whores nor Submissives") says the number of forced marriages has risen in recent years, with roughly 70,000 girls pressured into unwanted relationships each year in France. A leaked study conducted between October 2003 and May 2004 under the auspices of France's inspector-general of education, Jean Pierre Obin, described an educational system where Muslim

students regularly boycotted classes that concerned Voltaire, Rousseau and Moliere, whom the students accused of being anti-Islamic. Orbin's report cited Muslim students' refusal to use the "plus" sign in mathematics because it looks like a crucifix; Muslims boycotting class trips to churches, cathedrals and monasteries; and forcing wholesale changes in school lunch fare to accommodate their religious practices.

The influence of Islamic groups is a growing threat to French business, a leading intelligence expert warned, citing the discovery of secret prayer-rooms at the Disneyland theme-park outside Paris. A report commissioned by several retail and courier companies stated that the strategy is to "take control of Muslims within the workforce" and then "challenge the rules in order to impose Islamic values." French Interior Minister Nicolas Sarkozy said that the riots in 2005 were rather "well organized." Caroline Glick of the *Jerusalem Post* noted that some Muslim leaders explained that what they wanted was autonomy in their ghettos: "They seek to receive extraterritorial status from the French government, meaning that they will set their own rules based, one can assume, on Sharia law. If the French government accepts the notion of communal autonomy, France will cease to be a functioning state."

Following three weeks of unrest, the police said 98 vehicles torched in one day marked a "return to a normal situation everywhere in France." Some of the rioters left boasting messages on various Internet forums. "We aren't going to let up. The French won't do anything and soon, we will be in the majority here." One observer stated: "In France, the majority of young Muslims believe that French society is dying, committing suicide. More like 10 percent to 20 percent of them believe that they are in the process of replacing European civilization with an Islamic one." In the southern city of Marseille, Muslims make up at least a quarter of the population, and rising fast.

In the Netherlands, Muslims will soon make up the majority in all major cities. "Today, we have 1 million Muslims out of 16 million Dutch," according to Frits Bolkestein, Dutch politician and former EU Commissioner. "Within 10 years, they will have an absolute majority in both Amsterdam and Rotterdam. We are staring into the face of a shortly to be divided community. Muslims have the right to their own schools, so there is no teaching of evolution, gay teachers are not tolerated but anti-Semitism is." A researcher for the Netherlands Ministry for Immigration and Integration found that 40% of young Moroccan Muslims in the Netherlands rejected Western values and democracy. Six to seven percent were prepared to use force to "defend" Islam, and the majority were opposed to freedom of speech for offensive statements, particularly criticism of Islam.

Dyab Abu Jahjah is the founder of the Arab European League (AEL). The AEL, founded in Belgium in 2000, has branches in the Netherlands and France and intends to spread across the EU. Jahjah, who has called the 9/11 attacks "sweet revenge," recruits Muslim youth to spread his ideology, which calls for the introduction of sharia in Europe. "We have three basic demands," he says. "Bilingual education for Arab-speaking kids, hiring quotas that protect Muslims, and the right to keep our cultural customs." "Assimilation is cultural rape. It means renouncing your identity, becoming like the others." Jahjah has also demanded that Arabic should be made an official language in Belgium. Belgium's Jews, in particular Antwerp's diamond merchants, have felt threatened by the Arab European League (AEL), which issued a statement: "The AEL calls on the Jewish community in Antwerp to cease its support of, and distance itself from, the state of Israel. If not, attacks in Antwerp are almost unpreventable."

Security sources in Germany warned that the country was home to between 3,000 and 5,000 potential Islamic suicide attackers. A Berlin court in 2005 ruled that a well-known Turkish religious leader should be extradited to Turkey. In his Berlin mosque he repeatedly said that "all Germans were stinking people and doomed to go to hell because they were useless creatures and infidels." Shortly before, the press spokesman of this mosque had told about the Turks' strong interest in fostering good relations with native Germans. TV correspondent Reinhard Laska feared that the opinions voiced by the Imam were only the tip of the iceberg: "There was nobody in the mosque who stood up and demanded that the Imam stop his nasty talk about Germans," he said. "Nobody seemed to mind at all." In 2006, "Valley of the Wolves," a virulently anti-Semitic film about the Iraq war, sold out to cheering audiences from Germany's 2.5 million-strong Turkish community.

Dozens of women in Germany have been murdered in so-called honor killings in the past decade. Their crime? Trying to break free and live Western lifestyles. Within their communities, the killers are revered as heroes for preserving their family dignity. Much of this insular and ultra-religious world is out of public view, "often hidden in inner-city apartments where the most influential links to the outside world are satellite dishes that

receive Turkish and Arabic television and the local mosque.” “In these families, loyalty and honor are elevated virtues and women are treated little better than slaves, unseen by society and often unnoticed or ignored by their German neighbors.” It caused an outcry when a group of 14-year-old Turkish boys mocked one victim during a class discussion. “She deserved what she got. The whore lived like a German.”

In Denmark, the nation-wide organization of Women’s Crisis Centres claims that a number of taxi drivers with immigrant background are spying on female immigrants who are in hiding, sending information about their whereabouts to their families. It was a group of taxi drivers who informed a Pakistani man where he could find his sister. He murdered her in broad daylight outside a train station because she had married a man from Afghanistan against her family’s orders. 80% of the women seeking help at crisis centres in the city of Oslo, Norway, are from immigrant background.

Prominent critic of Islam Lars Hedegaard, quoted by Bruce Bawer in *While Europe Slept* takes a dark view of the future:

“‘If there’s any hope,’ Hedegaard suggested dryly, borrowing a line he knew I’d recognize from 1984, ‘it lies in the proles.’ Yet we both knew that the ‘proles’ — if they did take over the reins from the elite — might well lead Europe back down the road to fascism. He did admit that he was glad to be living in Denmark and not elsewhere in Western Europe: ‘If there’s any place where there’s hope, it’s got to be this country.’ But Hedegaard didn’t hold out much hope even for Denmark. ‘Unless they build up a cadre of intellectuals in Europe who can think,’ he said, America ‘can kiss Europe good-bye.’ The Continent’s future, he predicted, ‘is going to be vastly different than we imagine. It’s going to be war. Like Lebanon,’ with some enclaves dominated by Christians and others by Muslims. There will be ‘permanent strife,’ and no one will have the ‘power to mollify or mediate... It will be more gruesome than we can imagine.’ When the horror comes, he warned, the journalists who helped to bring it about will ‘wag their heads and flee — and leave it to those who can’t flee to fight it out.’”

The massive concentration of Muslims in major European cities will have dramatic consequences, some of which are already visible. If it is allowed to continue, it will destroy the coherence of society that is necessary for our legal systems to work. Increased urban insecurity means that the state is not able to guarantee the security of its citizens. If ordinary citizens feel that the state is no longer able to guarantee the safety of their loved ones, then perhaps native Europeans will create groups and “clans” of their own, to counter the Muslim clans. The result will be a re-tribalization of our countries. The downfall of the nation state, if it happens, will be chaotic, painful and bloody. Can it still be avoided? Only time will tell.



## Eastern Europe and the New Threats to Freedom

*This essay was first published at the Gates of Vienna blog in September 2008. It is republished here with some changes.*

*“Political correctness is communist propaganda writ small. In my study of communist societies, I came to the conclusion that the purpose of communist propaganda was not to persuade or convince, nor to inform, but to humiliate; and therefore, the less it corresponded to reality the better. When people are forced to remain silent when they are being told the most obvious lies, or even worse when they are forced to repeat the lies themselves, they lose once and for all their sense of probity. To assent to obvious lies is to co-operate with evil, and in some small way to become evil oneself. One’s standing to resist anything is thus eroded, and even destroyed. A society of emasculated liars is easy to control. I think if you examine political correctness, it has the same effect and is intended to.” — Writer Theodore Dalrymple to [FrontPage Magazine](#)*

The Dutch cartoonist [Nekschot](#) (‘Neck Shot’), a friend of the late Theo van Gogh, the filmmaker who was slaughtered by a Muslim, in 2008 became the first-ever cartoonist in modern Western history to be arrested. Gregorius [Nekschot](#) was kept in custody for 30 hours for cartoons that are “discriminatory against Muslims and people of darker skin,” as the Public Prosecutor’s Office (OM) in Amsterdam put it. Around 10 police dragged him out of his home in Amsterdam, seized his computer and telephone and told him that his real name would be revealed. Nekschot was released two days later. A complaint had been filed against him in 2005 by the Dutch imam Abdul Jabbar van de Ven, a radical Dutch convert to Islam. After the murder of filmmaker Theo van Gogh, Abdul Jabbar van de Ven said on TV he would thank Allah if he could arrange for the Islam-critical MP Geert Wilders to die, “for example of cancer.”

The arrest of Gregorius Nekschot for a “Multicultural thought crime” was another low for the Netherlands, a country which a few years earlier was known for its openness and tolerance. It was also a new low for the “free West,” which suddenly looks a lot less free.

Lars Hedegaard, President of the Danish Free Press Society/[Trykkefrihedsselskabet](#) has, together with colleagues Helle Merete Brix and Torben Hansen been one of the leading forces behind making tiny Denmark into a frontline state in the battle against Islam. Bruce Bawer gives an account of a meeting with Hedegaard and Brix in Copenhagen in his best-selling book [While Europe Slept: How Radical Islam is Destroying the West from within](#):

“Hedegaard was of the view, however, that the Danish establishment’s benign neglect of Islamic extremism must have deeper causes than snobism or hippie nostalgia.. After all, he said, the Islamicization of the Nordic countries was ‘the most fundamental transformation’ they’d experienced in a millennium. Something so monumental, in his opinion, could not be explained simply by a few people’s foolishness or class snobbery. ‘Heavy consequences,’ he insisted, ‘must have heavy causes.’ The surrender of Denmark to Muslims had to be the result of some deep-seated compulsion...His theory was that Western Europe’s ongoing surrender to radical Islam had its roots in the psychic devastation of the First World War. For while that conflict marked America’s ascent to the rank of Great Power, Europeans took it as a devastating proof, Hedegaard said, ‘that our culture was worthless. It was basically destroyed. And that prepared the way for two sorts of totalitarianism’ — Nazism and Communism — and for ‘atrocities of a magnitude that is hard to imagine.’ Those atrocities, in turn, placed upon Europeans an unbearable burden of guilt. The Nazis, he said, ‘made Europe think it is doomed and sinful...and deserves what it has coming.’“

The destruction brought about by WW1 and WW2 did indeed finished off much of Europe’s self-confidence. The problem is more complex than that, though. If you look at which countries suffered the most during these wars, there is no automatic correlation between that and which countries are most culturally suicidal today. Poland, for instance, is less suicidal than my country, which didn’t take part in WW1 and suffered less than many other nations during WW2. Sweden didn’t (formally) participate in either war; neither did Switzerland. Both of these countries lack a colonial history (if you believe this is about a “post-colonial guilt complex”), yet Sweden is absolutely crazy, as those reading my essays would know.

In [June 2008](#), Swedish lawmakers voted in favor of a controversial bill allowing all emails and phone calls to be monitored in the name of national security. The new law, set to take effect on January 1st, 2009, will enable



the National Defence Radio Establishment (FRA) — a civilian agency despite its name — to tap all cross-border Internet and telephone communication. Critics say the law — passed by a parliament with a “center-right” majority — will make Sweden more totalitarian than the former Communist dictatorships of Eastern Europe. Even the infamous Stasi in East Germany didn’t have as extensive means of surveillance against private citizens as Sweden will now have.

In order to explain this, we need to consider the prolonged and extremely destructive impact of Marxism in its various forms. It is supremely ironic that the countries in the western half of Europe, which during the Cold War were a part of the “free world,” are in some ways more damaged by Marxist indoctrination than the countries in the eastern half of Europe, where people lived under Communism for generations. We in the West have been undermined by a different strand of Marxism, one seemingly less serious since we have no Gulag here (yet), but one which slowly erodes your very will to live and removes your identity as a people.

Former Soviet dissident Vladimir Bukovsky thinks [the West lost the Cold War](#). “There were no Nuremberg-type trials in Moscow. Why? Because while we won the Cold War in a military sense, we lost it in the context of ideas. The West stopped one day too soon, just like in Desert Storm. Just imagine the Allies in 1945 being satisfied with some kind of Perestroika in Nazi Germany — instead of unconditional surrender. What would have been the situation in Europe then, to say nothing of Germany? All former Nazi collaborators would have remained in power, albeit under a new disguise. This is exactly what happened in the Soviet Union in 1991...Communism might have been dead, but the communists remained in power in most of the former Warsaw bloc countries, while their Western collaborators came to power all over the world (in Europe in particular). This is nothing short of a miracle...When the Nazis lost the Second World War, racial hatred was discredited. When the Soviets lost the [Cold War](#), the tenet of class hatred remained as popular as ever.”

Bukovsky argues that while there might have been a Western military victory, Socialism still prevailed as a popular idea throughout the world. He writes: “Having failed to finish off conclusively the communist system, we are now in danger of integrating the resulting monster into our world. It may not be called communism anymore, but it retained many of its dangerous characteristics....Until the [Nuremberg-style tribunal](#) passes its judgement on all the crimes committed by communism, it is not dead and the war is not over.”

According to Czech President [Václav Klaus](#), although Communism or the “hard version” of Socialism is probably over this has not automatically led “to a system we would like to have and live in.” The dominant economic and social system of current Western civilization is based on big and patronizing government, on “extensive regulating of human behavior and on large-scale income redistribution.”

Klaus urges all freedom loving Europeans “to understand this contemporary version of world-wide socialism, because our old concepts may omit some of the crucial features of what is around us just now. We may even find out that the continuous use of the term socialism can be misleading.” The new version of post-Marxist collectivism wants privileges for organized groups, and “in consequence, a refeudalization of society..., multiculturalism, feminism, apolitical technocratism (based on the resentment against politics and politicians), internationalism (and especially its European variant called Europeanism) and a rapidly growing phenomenon I call NGOism.”

It is no exaggeration to say that a generation after the Cold War ended, various Marxists or related left-wingers control much of the education system and the media in the Western world. As I’ve written in my essay [Democracy and the Media Bias](#), native Europeans face three enemies simultaneously when fighting against the Islamization of their lands:

- Enemy 1 is the anti-Western bias of our media and academia, which is a common theme throughout the Western world.
- Enemy 2 are Eurabians and EU-federalists, who deliberately break down established nation states in favor of a pan-European superstate.
- Enemy 3 are Muslims.

The fact that members of the media and the academia tend to be more, sometimes a lot more, left-leaning

politically than the average populace is well-attested and documented in all the Western countries I have been able to check, and it seems a fair guess that this trend is universal throughout the Western world. But why is the situation like this?

One could claim that this is the effect of the Western Cultural Revolution of the 1960s and 1970s, or alternatively a product of the Cold War. But if you believe the esteemed Friedrich Hayek in his writings about Socialism and the intellectuals, the trend was discernible already in the late 1940s, before the Cold War. How do we explain that? One plausible hypothesis could be to assume that those with conservative viewpoints will generally direct their energies towards business and commerce, while those with left-leaning sympathies desire to get into positions where they can influence people's minds. Over time, this could mean that in an open society, the media, the academia and the intelligentsia will tend to gravitate towards the political Left and become dominated by people sympathetic towards Utopian ideas. Because of the positions they have gained, their political bias will significantly influence what information is presented to the general masses, and how.

The most important reason for the general passivity of Western Europeans is that they still don't understand just how bad the EU is and how organized its pro-Islamic betrayal is. The EU's primary weapon is deception, combined with extreme levels of organizational complexity and incomprehensible bureaucratic language. The EU's secondary weapon is the general Western respect for law and reluctance to stage armed rebellions. Nevertheless, it is true that Western Europeans follow rules and regulations without asking too many questions. I have earlier asked whether the EU could have been established if people had not been accustomed to living in complex welfare state bureaucracies before, and the likely answer to that is no. The EU is an empire of bureaucrats, established in countries where bureaucrats already ruled. Their work has been made easier by populations conditioned by generations of indoctrination with cultural Marxism.

Cultural Marxism is an invention designed to destroy Western capitalism. Since under Soviet occupation there was no capitalism to be destroyed, cultural Marxism never came to existence there. I have explained this in the essay [Political Correctness — The Revenge of Marxism](#).

I have heard people who have grown up in former Communist countries say that we in the West are at least as brainwashed by Multiculturalism and Political Correctness as they ever were with Communism, perhaps more so. The scary thing is, I sometimes believe they are right. A Norwegian newspaper called Dagens Næringsliv exposed the fact that the largest "anti-racist" organization in the country, SOS Rasisme, was heavily infiltrated by Communists and extreme Leftists. They infiltrated the organization in the late 1980s and early '90s, in other words, during the downfall of Communism in Eastern Europe. They went directly from Communism to Multiculturalism, which should indicate that at least some of them viewed Multiculturalism as the continuation of Communism by other means. It speaks volumes about the close connection between economic Marxism and cultural Marxism. They just have different means of reaching the same ends.

The separation of church and state in the West paved the way for greater political liberty, but it was never intentionally designed to do so. In other words: One of the greatest inventions in European history was unplanned. In contrast, the Communist societies in Eastern Europe planned the entire society down to the last detail, and they failed miserably. The lesson is: You cannot plan everything and shouldn't try. Yet the EU is now doing this same mistake, only in a slightly different way. That is why calling it the EUSSR is more than just a joke.

Multiculturalism has infected the entire Western world, not just Western Europe, but it has become institutionalized to an alarming degree in the EU. Maybe the countries of east-central Europe will be the strongholds of European civilization in this century; that is conceivable. But as long as they are members of the European Union, the official Multiculturalism and cultural Marxism of the EUSSR will slowly but surely destroy them, too. This is why it is of such great importance to get rid of the EU, to ensure that at least some regions of Europe can survive and hopefully regenerate.

I have used the word "totalitarian" about the EU a number of times. What I mean by that is not that the EU is a fully totalitarian entity today, but that it is adopting measures which will increasingly move the organization and the continent towards totalitarianism. Frankly, the pace with which the EU moves in a totalitarian direction is greater than I anticipated a couple of years ago. This trend has been aided by the tensions created by mass immigration in general and Muslim immigration in particular. I have more than once wondered

whether mass immigration has been introduced specifically to destroy any internal coherence in formerly stable, democratic nation states and facilitate the transfer of power to a new authoritarian oligarchy. Even if that wasn't the intended result, it certainly is the actual result so far.

History has demonstrated that in order to commit evil on a truly monumental scale, you need the support of ideology backed by bureaucrats, jurists and the machinery of a totalitarian state. The Hungarian author Imre Kertész, Holocaust survivor and winner of the Nobel Prize in Literature, writes in the magazine signandsight.com that "the genuine novelties of the twentieth century were the totalitarian state and Auschwitz. The anti-Semitism of the nineteenth century, for instance, was as yet barely able, nor even would have wished, to imagine a Final Solution. Auschwitz, therefore, cannot be accounted for by the common-or-garden, archaic, not to say classical concepts of anti-Semitism...In order to murder millions of Jews the totalitarian state had need, in the final analysis, not so much of anti-Semites as good organisers. We need to see clearly that no totalitarianism of party or state can exist without discrimination, and the totalitarian form of discrimination is necessarily mass murder."

Discrimination against native Europeans is now mandatory in the EU, as they are the only ethnic groups who should not be allowed to retain their culture. Racism against whites is rarely presented as a problem. It is presumably OK, merely an extension of the official government policies.

Kertész warns, timely in these Multicultural days, that "a civilisation that does not clearly proclaim its values, or which leaves these proclaimed values high and dry, is stepping on the path to perdition and terminal debility. Then others will pronounce their values, and in the mouths of these others they will no longer be values but just so many pretexts for untrammelled power, untrammelled destruction."

This is exactly what is happening in the capital city of the European Union, in Brussels, Belgium. In September 2007 Freddy Thielemans, the mayor of Brussels, banned a demonstration against the Islamization of Europe, even though virtually all kinds of demonstrations are usually allowed. When some demonstrators did show up for a peaceful demonstration anyway, they were brutally arrested by the police. According to Thielemans, "I decided to forbid the September 11 demonstration," the mayor wrote, because "First and foremost the organizers have chosen the symbolic date of 9/11. The intention is obviously to confound the terrorist activities of Muslim extremists on the one hand and Islam as a religion and all Muslims on the other hand...Such incitement to discrimination and hatred, which we usually call racism and xenophobia, is forbidden by a considerable number of international treaties and is punished by our penal laws and by the European legislation."

Mr. Thielemans 'ruling Socialist party, the largest party in Brussels, caters for Muslim immigrants. The majority of its municipal council are Muslims. Even though Mr. Thielemans is against criticism of Islam, he doesn't mind mocking Christians. In 2005, upon hearing the news of the death of Pope John Paul II, he ordered "Champagne for everyone!" This means that the authorities in the heart of the EU are enforcing sharia law and banning the natives from protesting against their own displacement. The authorities no longer have any legitimacy whatsoever.

Native Europeans are guinea pigs in an evil social experiment, a recycled version of the Communist idea of perpetual peace. Since wars are caused by "differences," the way to permanently end all wars is to permanently end all differences. While the Communists focused on economic differences, the Globalists and Multiculturalists focus on cultural, religious and racial differences. Once these have been erased and all people have been merged into one, starting with white majority Western nations since they are most "different," we will all live in peace. There will be no more national borders or national laws. All laws will be passed by the United Nations, and the world will be as one. We will be one global nation, one nation, under sharia. We may no longer be able to walk the streets in our cities in safety, but it's for a good cause.

I wonder what future generations will call this time period. The Age of Insanity? The Age of Humiliation? Or perhaps the Age of Betrayal? There are many alternatives. Let us hope it will be followed by an Age of Revival.

## On Germany and Muslims

*First published at the Gats of Vienna blog in August 2008. Republished here with some additions.*

In December 2004, the Turkish Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdogan warned European Union leaders that they would pay a heavy price in escalating violence from Islamic extremists if the EU rejected Turkey as a member and confirmed itself as a Christian club. Turkey is a member of a Muslim club, the Organization of the Islamic Conference (OIC), yet doesn't face escalating violence from Christian extremists because of this. Mr. Erdogan failed to mention that, yet his thinly veiled threat was well understood by European leaders. In September 2005 Jack Straw, the then Foreign Secretary of Tony Blair's Labour government in Britain, stated that snubbing Ankara's EU membership hopes would give ammunition to Islamic extremists, while welcoming it into the EU would help avert a "clash of civilizations."

Obviously pleased with this progress towards European submission to Muslim demands, PM Erdogan in February 2008 suggested that Germany should found Turkish-medium high schools and universities and pleaded for existing German high schools to hire teachers from Turkey. The suggestion took German Chancellor Angela Merkel by surprise.

As Austrian blogger correspondent ESW wrote in April 2008:

"There are currently three hotspots regarding mosques (including the works such as minarets): One is located in the provincial capital of Linz, about 120 miles west of Vienna. Another mosque is planned in Bad Vöslau, a small town south of Vienna. The hottest spot, however, is located in Vienna, in the district of Brigittenau, a district with one of the highest percentage of immigrants (read Muslims) in Austria... ATIB has been planning the massive enlargement of this mosque for the past decade. These plans include the erection of a larger mosque with an area of 1,500 square meters and a capacity of 1,000 worshippers, a Turkish supermarket (why Turkish? An Austrian supermarket isn't good enough?), a kindergarten, seminar rooms, as well as apartments. These plans go far beyond the argument of 'free religious practice' in order to build a large mosque. The area surrounding the mosque is bound to become a pilgrimage center. The already unbearable effects of this cultural center include noise, exhaust pollution, and a lack of parking. The organizers of the civil resistance group are demanding the shutdown of this Islamic center and its moving to a suitable location outside residential areas."

ATIB is the Turkish-Islamic Union for Cultural and Social Cooperation in Austria. Turkey supports the mosque-building in Europe where there are large Turkish communities, in Germany, Austria and elsewhere. Turkey sees its citizens as soldiers to spread its ideology. As Turkish Prime Minister Erdogan says: "Don't assimilate, assimilation is the greatest crime."

In December 2007, a Turkish lawyer filed a complaint after the Italian football club Inter wore a shirt with an "offensive symbol." The shirt's scheme saw a big red Christian cross on a white background, a symbol of the city of Milan. Swiss football referee Massimo Busacca vowed that he would wear a whistle with the Swiss Cross symbol on it during of the Saudi championship, despite the fact that many in Saudi Arabia had called for Busacca to sport a different whistle to avoid offending Muslims. The Swiss Cross is Switzerland's national flag.

In the spring of 2006, police were deployed at a Berlin school after teachers complained that they could not cope with their students' aggression and disrespect. A teacher who recently left the school told the *Tagesspiegel* newspaper that ethnic Arab pupils were bullying ethnic Turks, Germans and other nationalities. "School for them," said Petra Eggebrecht, former director of the Rütli school, "is simply a place to fight for peer recognition, where young criminals become idols." Young people are also easy targets for Islamist organisations. Outside the Rütli school, the children greeted visitors in Arabic.

When reporters went to school they were pelted with paving stones by masked youths from the schoolyard as the district's mayor stood helplessly at the entrance of the building. An increasing problem in German schools is that Arab male students often refuse to respect the authority of women teachers. Students at the Ruetli Hauptschule were not shy about expressing their views to reporters. "The German (students) brown nose us, pay for things for us and stuff like that, so that we don't smash in their faces." But there are also conflicts between Arab and Turkish students, mirrored in battles between the city's foreign-dominated youth gangs.



Integration of foreign youths in Berlin is often poor. Even second and third generation children frequently do not speak fluent German and many fail to complete school — all of which leads to a high jobless rate among immigrant youths. White German families are moving out of districts like Neukoelln.

Muslims in European countries are busy building parallel societies, and there are now rapidly expanding no-go zones in various German cities where the natives, even the police, risk being physically attacked by Muslim gangs. A gym in the city of Cologne, Germany, is specifically designed for Muslim women. In the Ehrenfeld city district, Muslim women who want to be physically fit can follow the lead of female personal trainers at the “Hayat” (which means “life” in Turkish) gym and still keep their clothes on. Others want to open up more fitness centers where Muslim women can get a great work-out while remaining “modest.”

In late August 2008 an elderly Cologne Council member, Hans-Martin Breninek, was beaten unconscious and sent to hospital by young Turks. The group of Turks, who had a “fighting dog,” managed to flee before the police arrived. Thanks to people passing by, Breninek was not more severely wounded as he lay on the ground. This happened in the heart of Cologne, yet this did not deter the “youths” from attacking the 67-year-old man. He was handing out information warning against the Islamization of his country and his continent.

Meanwhile, Indonesia, the world’s largest Muslim country, considered the plans to hold an anti-Islamization congress in Cologne on Sept 19-20 2008 to be counterproductive to interfaith dialogues. “Any plan to organize an anti-Islam congress would be counter-productive to interfaith dialogs which also involve European nations,” Foreign Ministry spokesman Teuku Faizasyah said. The Organization of the Islamic Conference (OIC), of which Indonesia is a prominent member, expressed deep concern regarding the planned congress and expressed hope that all elements of the community in Germany and the rest of Europe would be strongly opposed to the planned congress and “reject hatred and racism.”

The OIC has a newly established Islamophobia Observatory based in Jeddah, Saudi Arabia. At the same time, thousands of Christian churches have been destroyed by Muslim mobs in Indonesia in recent years, and practicing any other religion than Islam is banned by law in Saudi Arabia. Those violating this, even in their private homes, risk being deported or worse.

Groups in Switzerland, among them the Swiss People’s Party, managed to collect enough signatures to force a nationwide referendum on banning minarets, the distinctive towers of Islamic architecture. The president of Switzerland, Pascal Couchepin, said the government would recommend that voters reject the proposed minaret ban.

Foreign Minister Micheline Calmy-Rey warned that the anti-minaret campaign would provoke Muslim anger and cause security problems. (Swiss conservatives earlier criticized Calmy-Rey for wearing a headscarf during a visit to Iran, saying it was a sign of submission.) World Radio Switzerland said it was unusual for the government to take a position against a referendum initiative so quickly. It said “Swiss diplomacy and economic sectors are worried that this kind of initiative could unleash the same kind of anger [and] calls for a boycott” as those that met the publication of the Danish cartoons satirizing Muhammad.

Foreign Minister Calmy-Rey told Swiss ambassadors gathered in the capital Bern that they needed to talk to “heavyweight political figures” on the world stage even if they are considered persona non grata. “This even goes as far as sitting down at the same table as Al-Qaida leader Osama bin Laden,” she said.

Sticking to their usual pro-Islamic, Multicultural agenda, the headline in British newspaper The Guardian was: “Islamophobia: Swiss far right seeks vote on minarets ban.” Recep Tayyip Erdogan, ex-mayor of Istanbul, now Turkey’s Prime Minister and a “reformed, moderate Muslim,” has earlier stated that “the mosques are our barracks, the minarets our bayonets, the domes our helmets, and the believers our soldiers.” As Hugh Fitzgerald of Jihad Watch says:

“The minaret is merely a sign of power. It is a sign of dominion over the nearby churches and synagogues. Why do you think that, according to the Shari’a, no church or synagogue can be built higher than a nearby mosque? Why do you think that mosques were always built on the highest ground? For a nice example, see the mosque in Grenada that was opened a few years ago. The Spanish government thought it would be a great idea. They thought it would be a demonstration of real ‘tolerance’ for Muslims that would somehow be reciprocated. Of course it wasn’t. That mosque looms over a convent and a church, and with its Call to Prayer has disrupted



the quiet lives of the nuns, who actually dared to protest. To no avail. Of course. Minarets are claims of power. They are claims to dominance. That is what they are. And that is what these Swiss, who were called — you know what they were called — ‘far right-wing’ Swiss, have properly identified.”

The United Nation’s “expert on racism,” Doudou Diène, stated that the Swiss campaign is evidence of an “ever-increasing trend” toward anti-Islamic actions in Europe. In August 2008, the [UN Committee](#) on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination said there was room for improvement but that the Swiss authorities were motivated and taking the issue seriously. During the UN Human Rights Council’s Universal Periodic Review the Swiss had to answer numerous questions about the “xenophobic climate” in Switzerland and the “incitements to racial hatred by certain political parties.”

The UN committee was looking for “top-down” leadership from the Swiss government to help change the mindset of the general public and for it to be a “champion for this cause,” clearly a call for more Multicultural propaganda and public indoctrination through the media and the education system. The committee also addressed the absence of an anti-discrimination law in Switzerland. Switzerland is not a member of the EU, but the EU has in recent years, in close cooperation with pan-European organizations such as the Council of Europe and international Islamic organizations, passed a number of draconian anti-discrimination laws more or less ordering native Europeans to submit to continued colonization through mass immigration.

Norway, which is not a full member of the EU but an associated member and subject to most EU legislation, passed a radical Discrimination Act in 2005, covering all sectors of society. The Act says more or less explicitly that in cases of suspected discrimination, the natives are guilty of “discriminating” against immigrants until proven otherwise. It was passed by national authorities following transnational initiatives and recommendations by the [Council of Europe](#), with virtually no public debate. Similar laws have been passed by the EU, in close cooperation with the CoE, the Arab League, the Organization of the Islamic Conference and others, in Sweden, Germany, Belgium and a number of other countries I am aware of.

The United Nation’s [racism watchdog](#) called on Germany and Switzerland to combat rising racial discrimination against ethnic minorities, specifically mentioning Muslims. Doudou Diène also levelled tough criticism at Switzerland in a 2007 report for what he said were “discriminatory tendencies.” During an international media conference in Oslo in June 2007, Mr. Doudou Diène, the United Nations Special Envoy for racism, xenophobia and intolerance, urged the media to actively participate in the creation of a Multicultural society, and expressed concerns that the democratic process could lead to immigration-restrictive parties gaining influence in Western nations, for instance in Denmark and Switzerland.

Diène said that it is a dangerous development when increasing numbers of intellectuals in the West believe that some cultures are better than others, and stated that “The media must transform diversity, which is a fact of life, into pluralism, which is a set of values.” Getting diversity accepted is the role of the education system, and acceptance is the role of the law. “Promoting and defending diversity is the task of the media.” Societies must recognize, accept and promote diversity, which for some curious reason always seems to imply Islamic sharia.

Doudou Diène is the ultimate symbol of the loss of Western identity and willpower. He represents Senegal, an African Muslim country which is a member of the Organization of the Islamic Conference (OIC), the largest voting bloc at the United Nations, sponsored by Arab oil money. The OIC has become increasingly aggressive in recent years in infiltrating UN organs and promoting concepts such as “Islamophobia” as dangerous trends which should be banned by international law. Western countries are still the greatest financial contributors to the UN, which means that we are supposed to finance a deeply corrupt organization increasingly dedicated to destroying our countries and turning them into obedient dumping grounds for the excess population growth in Islamic countries. In Africa, the few remaining whites suffer from brutal racist persecution at the same time as millions of Africans take it for granted that they can colonize European cities and get paid for this. So the motto is “Europeans in Africa bad, Africans in Europe good.”

In Austria, the authorities have indicted politician [Susanne Winter](#) on charges of incitement and degradation of religious symbols and agitation after Ms Winter said that Muhammad was “a child molester” because he had married a six-year-old girl. She also said he was “a warlord.” The politician, a member of the Austrian Freedom Party FPÖ, added that Islam is “a totalitarian system of domination that should be cast back to its birthplace on the other side of the Mediterranean.” She warned for “a Muslim immigration tsunami,” saying

that “in 20 or 30 years, half the population of Austria will be Muslim” if the present immigration policies continue. Following her remarks, Muslim extremists threatened to kill Winter and she was placed under police protection. Later, the Justice Department in Vienna announced that Ms Winter would be charged with “incitement and degradation of religious symbols.”

It says quite specifically and repeatedly in Islamic religious texts that Muhammad married one of his wives, Aisha, when she was six years old, and had sex with her when she was nine and he was in his fifties. Since Muhammad is the “living Koran” and his personal example, his Sunna, is valid for time eternity, this is still allowed today according to sharia law. As Dr. Ahmad Al-Mu’bi, a Saudi Arabian marriage officiant, said on TV June 19, 2008: “The Prophet Muhammad is the model we follow. He took ‘Aisha to be his wife when she was six, but he had sex with her only when she was nine.” In August 2008, the Saudi mother of an eight-year-old girl was trying to stop her daughter marrying a much older man, one of many similar marriages in the country. The father’s consent is needed to validate the marriage contract between the girl and the man, who is in his fifties.

When Susanne Winter suggested that Muhammad had sex with a child, she was stating a fact which is recognized in Islamic sources, and for this she gets legally prosecuted. Muslims have been at the gates of Vienna several times. This time, they are already on the inside and increasingly dictating the terms, turning the local authorities into enforcers of sharia rather than protectors and servants of their people. Sadly, Austria is far from unique in this regard.

When reading about a topic seemingly unrelated to Islam, about the creation of the first mechanical clocks (this innovation took place only in Europe), I found out that the Germans paid “Turk money” in the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries until they became strong enough to refuse. It is almost impossible to overestimate the prolonged impact Jihad has had on European history since the seventh century AD. The southern half of Europe obviously suffered the most, but almost no region of the continent totally escaped the Islamic threat. The Germans were never under Islamic rule, but even they had to pay tribute, or jizya, for a while.

I am increasingly becoming aware of how much Islam isolated Europe from the rest of the world. Even in Greco-Roman times, especially during the principate, the mature period of the Roman Empire in the first and second centuries AD, there were regular contacts between Mediterranean Europe and India via Egypt and the Red Sea. After the seventh century, this region was controlled by largely hostile Muslims, which made regular trade with the major Asian civilizations beyond the Middle East very difficult.

There were few Europeans travelling to the Far East before Marco Polo and others following the Mongol conquests. Not zero, but few. Europe was during this time surrounded to the south and east by largely hostile Muslims, and to the north there was ice and more ice. The only possibility Europeans had to escape the clutches of Islam was to go west or southwest, which is what they eventually did. Contact with the Americas was to a large extent triggered by a desire to get away from the Muslim stranglehold on the continent. Muslims kept Europeans in a state of artificial geographical isolation for the better part of a thousand years.

I know many Austrians and Germans still suffer from a guilt complex from WW2, but this is deeply misplaced with regards to Muslims, and Turks in particular. Turks are guilty of more than one thousand years of persecution and genocide against various European peoples and are in no position to complain, with their main victims in the Balkans. They threatened European freedom for centuries, and many Muslims both within and outside of Turkey now apparently want to resurrect the Ottoman Empire and use the Balkans as a launching pad for Jihad against Europe. They get help in this undertaking from the European Union.

The EU is, among other things, a continuation of the propaganda methods of Nazi Germany and the unaccountable bureaucracy of the Soviet Union, two entities that put together killed more than one hundred million people. This makes it all the more insane that the Eurocrats and their Multiculturalist cheerleaders get away with labelling their critics “extremists.” EU Commissioner Margot Wallstrom said in 2005 that Europeans had to vote “yes” to the proposed EU Constitution or risk a new Holocaust. Forget the part that the EU is in the process of turning itself into a pan-European totalitarian state, a process that would be more or less completed with the proposed Constitution/Lisbon Treaty. The EU is thus using the memory of a previous totalitarian state in order to create a new totalitarian state. The organization is directly responsible for triggering a massive wave of street violence and political violence across the European continent, at least the

Western half of it.

The Germans have been — and still are — among the most dynamic of all European peoples. They are under no obligation to surrender their country and their dignity to barbarian and inferior cultures, and have every right to expel intruders from their lands and refuse to accept unlimited mass immigration. Original sin is a Christian concept, and in Christianity, it applies equally to all peoples, not to any particular nation. Young Germans should know their history, but they bear no guilt for what happened generations before they were born. I cannot see any particular reason why the Germans should be seen as the bad guys this time around. They are perhaps guilty of being too supportive of the EU, but I would still consider the EU to be primarily a French idea. As for Political Correctness, it has mainly been developed and spread from the English-speaking world, although it does contain seeds of earlier European ideas.

The entire Western world has been infected by the mental virus of Political Correctness. We are all sick, but some countries still have stronger immune systems than others. I don't think Germany is any sicker than France, Britain or Spain. Germany will be weighed down by its history and thus prevented from taking an early leading role in Europe's struggle for survival, yes. The early phases will likely be led by the Italians and smaller countries such as Denmark and Switzerland. But I wouldn't count the Germans out in the longer term. They have a golden opportunity to redeem themselves and play a role as defenders of European civilization.

When Gandhi asked the British to leave India he said, "You must understand that India is for Indians the way that England is for the English." As one American blog reader commented, Gandhi is considered a good guy and a hero while any German, Swiss, Austrian, Italian, Serb or Greek who says that his country belongs to his people is vilified. It's time we stop accepting this. Europeans have every bit as much right to fight for our existence as everybody else does.

## Freedom Fighting “Fascists”

*This essay was first published in September 2008 at the website Atlas Shrugs. It is republished here with some later changes.*

In late 2007 and early 2008, I was involved in a heated argument with the major American blog Little Green Footballs and its owner Charles Johnson. I haven't been thinking much about it since then because it consumed too much energy and I found it to be a waste of time. However, recent events have caused me to look at these issues once more. In the city of Cologne (Köln), Germany, a scheduled anti-Islamization demonstration was disrupted by an unholy alliance of Eurabian Multicultural elites and extreme Leftist “anti-Fascists.” As Thomas Landen put it in [The Brussels Journal](#):

“Last weekend's events in Cologne demonstrate what European conservatives are up against. A conference protesting the building of a mega mosque run by Turkish radicals was violently disrupted by thugs who gained the approval of the local German authorities and the German media. The international media, including the so-called ‘conservative’ media, have either not written about the Cologne incidents or done so by branding the conservatives as ‘Neo-Nazis’ and the thugs as ordinary citizens bravely fighting back ‘Nazism.’ An example of the latter can be found [in The Times of London](#).”

According to magazine [Der Spiegel](#), “an estimated 40,000 protesters turned up in Cologne's downtown Heumarkt area, many wearing clown suits, to disrupt the rally. They blocked urban trains to keep delegates away and raided a tourist boat shaped like a whale — called the ‘Moby Dick’ — where the far-right gathering had been hoping to hold a press conference. A Pro Cologne spokesman said, ‘Stones, bricks and paint bombs were thrown and the panoramic windows of the Moby Dick were shattered.’ Police cancelled the rally after 45 minutes. Pro Cologne organizers had to dismantle microphones and other equipment in Heumarkt while the overwhelmed riot cops tried to hold back the crowd of protesters.”

According to [Der Spiegel](#), Police had prepared for about 1,500 far-right activists, organized by the local ‘Pro Cologne’ movement, to make a public show of discussing what they called the ‘Islamization’ of Europe.”

As the esteemed American writer and columnist [Diana West](#) commented: “The suggestion here is that no non-‘far-right activist’ could possibly be so ‘far right’ as to imagine Europe is being Islamized...The point of the anti-Islamization rally was rational discussion. But Cologne proved it values neither reason nor discussion. ‘The city was ready.’ For mob rule.”

The supposedly conservative newspaper [Die Welt](#) put up an online [poll](#) asking their readers whether they thought it was OK to ban the anti-Islamization demonstration. According to the major blog [Link Text Politically Incorrect](#), as of midnight 86% disagreed with this policy. Suddenly, in the middle of the night, thousands of votes miraculously came in and the poll ended with exactly 50% in favor of the ban. [Die Welt](#) deleted the comment section because many comments criticized the decision to ban the Pro Cologne meeting.

Several eyewitnesses who were present this weekend were shocked by the behavior of the police, who in their eyes seemed to be acting as a surrogate of the left-wing “antifa” groups (supposedly anti-Fascists, although they tend to behave pretty much exactly like Fascists).

[Aviel](#), a Jewish man who was beaten up in Cologne on 20 September, explains:

“My [Jewish] friend, Michael Kucherov was the first casualty here on Friday. He got beaten up for trying to enter the first of our [=Pro Cologne] meetings on Friday. I sorely resent myself for not being there at that time for him. It rips me apart to hear about a Jew being beaten up in the streets of Germany. Well he wouldn't be the only Jew. The next day as I was trying to enter Heumarkt, I was beaten up by Antifa thugs on Eibahnstrasse. In both incidents, as we were being beaten up, they were yelling and screaming ‘Nazi’ which

was quite odd. Michael dressed in a suit but I was wearing my kippa and quite easily identified as a Jew so you can understand how odd it seems to be beaten by Germans in the street and called Nazi when you are Jewish. Anyway, I am going home with a broken rib but my pride still intact. I could have tried to escape or run but no way no how and I going to run or get on my knees for these people. Not this Jew. And one more thing, just let them all know that we (Jews) aren't all soft. Living here in Europe, we battle thugs and islamists all the time and still ask for more. That's why I traveled from France to Germany to make this conference. We are on the frontline of a battle which grows darker by the minute."

A Norwegian man blogging under the name maalmannen experienced something similar and posted many photos from the event:

"On several occasions, I observed people trying to join the demonstration being attacked and chased away by the leftist counter-demonstration. In one case, an old woman carrying a lot of anti-Islamization posters was attacked by a gang of Antifa activists. The rest of the crowd shouted 'Nazis raus' [Nazis out] when these criminals attacked the old *frau* and took all her posters away from her, and then ordered her to leave or risk more attacks."

Spanish writer AMDG from the blog La Yijad en Eurabia adds his observations:

"It was obviously not possible to enter the Heumarkt. I tried one of the narrow streets of the old city; there was a line of antifas with black clothing and sun glasses. They have even dared to place one of those plastic red-white stripes in front of them. I told one of them that I wanted to cross, they say no way. One of them spoke Spanish, and I ask her whether she was any authority, she confirmed it 'we are the authority'. A line of anti-riot police agents was only two meters behind them. I can not find a better image of the creeping Eurabian fascism: The police not only do not confront them, they cover their backs. Alternatively, we may think that the antifa-lefty militants are just the stormtroopers (Sturmabteilung?) of the formal police."

A number of those demonstrating for "democracy" and against "extremism" were Communists. I guess a hundred million dead victims of Communism in a few generations isn't a sign of extremism. Some also carried anti-Israeli slogans and merchandise using the icon of Marxist mass murderer and torturer Che Guevara. It is well-known that hardline Marxist organizations are still strong and influential in Germany, as in many other countries.

Many of those present noticed the militant-looking black outfits of some of the extreme Leftist demonstrators, which seemed to match closely with their attitudes. Since the term "Fascist" appears to be reserved for anti-Islamists and "racist" critics of mass immigration in general and Muslim immigration in particular, it is challenging to find a proper term for the militant antifa crowd. "Red Nazis" could be useful, but perhaps "blackshirts" or "blackhoods" are the most appropriate terms, alluding to the black clothing and uniforms they often wear.

According to AMDG, "I think that we should repeat this rally every year. We need to show the Europeans that the Nazis and the fascists are the lefties. We can only make it by insisting. We need to join also the counterdemo with banners showing verses of the Koran."

The decision to silence the demonstration against Islamization was supported by local authorities as well as national and probably supranational ones. Thomas Steg, spokesman for German Chancellor Angela Merkel, stated that Berlin favored "inter-cultural dialogue." The German Interior Ministry, too, criticized the rally, stating that "Such a gathering of populists and extremists harms the co-existence that the city and Muslim citizens have striven for."

Cologne Mayor Fritz Schramma, from the same "conservative" Christian Democratic Party (CDU) as Chancellor Angela Merkel, said on public radio that "We don't want their conference and along with a great majority of Cologne people we'll be obstructing them."



In my view, Cologne Mayor Fritz Schramma is a dhimmi collaborator. His actions betray his city, his country and his civilization. This was a shameful act of cowardice and appeasement of the Nazis of our time. The true heirs of the Nazis and the Communists, both in totalitarian mentality and in methods, were the blackshirt left-wingers who were present this day, not those who demonstrated against the Islamization of their continent. Schramma should resign immediately. It is nothing less than an international disgrace that after Germany has been freed from the Nazis and the Communists, the authorities in a major city in the largest country in Europe kneel to totalitarian thugs and allow them to rule the streets.

These blackshirts were deliberately allowed by the authorities to harass those who are critical of the official pro-Islamic policies. This confirms my long-held suspicion that the extreme Leftist thugs who assault immigration-critics in certain countries are a prolonged arm of the state. The “anti-Fascists” AFA in Sweden, for instance, openly brag about regular physical attacks against people they don’t like. They have been doing this for years. The media and the authorities know about it and do nothing. They like it, plain and simple.

As annoying as these Antifa groups can be, from what information I and others have been able to gather, they are not powerful enough to cause major problems unless they are allowed to do so by the authorities. They are strong in Sweden but exist in Germany, Belgium, the Netherlands, France and elsewhere. I know of at least one very violent attack by left-wing extremists on the peaceful Danish counter-Jihad organization SIAD in 2007 which could have been fatal, so they certainly have the potential to become violent. They have disrupted some of the legal activities of Filip Dewinter and others from the Vlaams Belang party in Belgium.

One of the foreign visitors in Cologne, the Flemish politician Filip Dewinter, criticized Cologne Mayor Schramma and compared him to Freddy Thielemans, the Socialist Mayor of Brussels, Belgium, who in 2007 and 2008 banned demonstrations commemorating the 2001 9/11 terror victims in the USA because he didn’t want to upset the local Muslims. “Brussels and Cologne have mayors who kneel and submit to Islamization,” Dewinter said.

The Iranians put pressure on the EU several times and summoned the French ambassador — France held the rotating presidency of the EU — to express deep concern over the EU’s lenient behavior toward anti-Islamic sentiments in Europe and suggested that European authorities prohibited the conference. Notice how they pressured the EU, not Germany. It is difficult to assess how much of an impact pressure from the Islamic Republic of Iran and other Muslim countries had in this case, but it’s quite likely that it contributed to the outcome. The implications of this are unmistakable and far-reaching: Muslim countries now feel, with some justification, that they can dictate what Europeans say or do in their own countries.

The LGF-crowd thinks that Europeans must prove that we are 100% “ideologically pure” before we should be granted the right to fight for our continued existence. Imagine if a house is on fire. The fire brigade has just arrived to put out the fire, but the neighbor won’t allow them to use the local water because he fears it may be impure. He will only accept that they use holy water — distilled holy water — and only if it has been blessed by a lesbian priest who supports voting rights for illegal immigrants. Since the firefighters don’t have this available, the house burns down, but the neighbor takes comfort in knowing that at least the remaining ash is ideologically pure. This is Little Green Football’s attitude to the threat faced by the Western world. In fact, their attitude is to say that the water is more dangerous than the fire itself, and to beat the firefighters with their umbrellas while screaming “Fascist bastards!”

The thinking seems to be that if you scratch any random European there is usually a Nazi lurking underneath, just waiting to get out. There are only two possible versions of Europeans: the surrender-monkeys and the Nazis. If we are not the former, then it follows by logic that we have to be the latter. This attitude betrays an all-pervasive hatred that demonizes absolutely anything Europeans do to protect their dignity and heritage. It closely mirrors Multiculturalism, which is an anti-Western, but especially anti-European, hate ideology.

As blogger Baron Bodissey says:

“European neo-Nazis are truly a fringe group. They are repugnant and/or a joke to the average European. They exist, but they are marginal, and will remain marginal...In order for a supra-national totalitarian state to function, all national identities and aspirations must be demonized and eradicated. Whenever a surge of national feeling appears, it must be beaten down with shouts of ‘Racist! Xenophobe! Fascist! NEO-NAZI!’ This is not to say that various people with previous neo-Nazi associations or inclinations aren’t involved in some European right-wing movements. They are, but they can only be electorally successful if they jettison their erstwhile allies and ideologies and embrace positions that resonate with a larger percentage of the population. A Nazi revival is a fantasy. Those who believe in it are chasing a phantom. It’s a Leftist fairy tale spun out of pure gossamer to frighten people away from conservative parties that support the right to a national identity. Those who echo the ‘Nazi!’ alarm are — wittingly or otherwise — aiding the cause of the Eurabian Marxists. Real Nazis almost invariably end up aligning with radical Islam.”

In October 2008, John Rosenthal published an essay revealing that “When protesters in Cologne last month managed, with the blessing of the city government, to prevent the holding of an ‘Anti-Islamification Congress,’ the cancellation of the event was widely hailed in the German and international media as a victory against “right-wing extremists” or, more simply put, ‘Nazis.’... A new report from the domestic intelligence service of the German city-state of Hamburg shows, however, that actual neo-Nazi groups in Germany — i.e., groups that themselves embrace this description — in fact likewise *opposed* the ‘Anti-Islamification Congress’ and are notably hostile to its sponsor, the ‘citizens’ movement Pro-Cologne [*Pro-Köln*].” For Nazis, Islam is regarded as a “global ally” in the fight against Jewish hegemony.

Nazism was essentially a new religion of Jihadism, which had much more in common with Islam than with Christianity. According to his architect Albert Speer, Adolf Hitler was fond of saying things such as: “You see, it’s been our misfortune to have the wrong religion. Why didn’t we have the religion of the Japanese, who regard sacrifice for the Fatherland as the highest good? The Mohammedan religion too would have been much more compatible to us than Christianity. Why did it have to be Christianity with its meekness and flabbiness?”

The admiration was mutual. In 2005, Hitler’s autobiography *Mein Kampf* was among the top bestsellers in Turkey, second only to a book about a Turkish national hero detonating a nuclear bomb in Washington D.C. Dehumanizing Jews as apes (Koran 2:65/7:166), or apes and pigs (Koran 5:60) has been common throughout Islamic history, more than 1300 years before the establishment of the state of Israel. Muhammad himself referred to the Medinan Jews of the Banu Qurayza as “apes” before orchestrating the slaughter of all of their men.

When the late 23 year-old Parisian Jew Ilan Halimi was being tortured to death in February 2006, his Muslim torturers, as journalist Nidra Poller wrote in the *Wall Street Journal* “...phoned the family on several occasions and made them listen to the recitation of verses from the Koran, while Ilan’s tortured screams could be heard in the background.” Halimi’s murderers did not invoke any non-Islamic sources of anti-Jewish hate, only the Koran. Islamic texts, the Koran and the hadith, are the causes of Islamic hatred of infidels, not “oppression.”

As this information demonstrates, those who disagreed with the anti-Islamization demonstration in Cologne were the Communists, the Nazis and the Muslims, among others. I cannot speak for anybody else, but if I ever find myself to be on the same side as three of the most evil ideologies in human history *at the same time*, I would stop and consider the possibility that my position could be horribly wrong in this case, and most likely is.

Neo-Nazis exist, but they are marginal for the simple reason that people don’t like them. They are universally shunned, as they should be. No major newspaper or TV station would ever hire a neo-Nazi, yet Marxists of all stripes work in Western media. In fact, the Marxists dominate the media, and they openly ally themselves with Muslims and champion Multiculturalism and mass immigration. The Islamic-Marxist alliance is powerful, constitutes a grave threat to our freedom and continued existence and must be smashed. The neo-Nazis are a

fringe group. They should be watched, but they are far down the list of enemies today. Those who focus more on the latter group than on the alliance of Marxists and Muslims simply don't understand what's going on or deliberately want to sabotage the anti-Jihad fight.

The Second World War was over more than 60 years ago. People should stop fighting the last war over again while we are on the defensive in the ongoing world war today. Germans and Austrians have every right to fight for their country, just like everybody else.

## The Case of Sweden

*This essay consists of bits and pieces of information from many different essays published between 2005 and 2008.*

There is a disproportionate amount of Scandinavian material in this book, obviously because I am Scandinavian myself and follow the developments in Norway, Sweden and Denmark closely in the native languages. The primary reason why I write much about Sweden is because it is one of the most totalitarian countries in the Western world. It is an interesting — and frightening — example of Political Correctness and self-loathing and can as such serve as a warning to others. Most of the problems described here exist throughout the Western world, although there is a difference in degree. The second reason is that Sweden, like my own country, needs some “tough love.” Too many Swedes still cling on to the myth of the “Swedish model” while their country is disintegrating. If Sweden the nation is to be saved — if it still can be saved, I’m not so sure — then Sweden the ideological beacon for mankind must be smashed, because vanity now blocks sanity.

I was involved, along with several others, in a heated public debate with Charles Johnson of the major American “anti-Jihad” blog Little Green Footballs (LGF) from late 2007 and well into 2008, which became bitter in part because we had traditionally been allies. I won’t go into the specific details here since this isn’t interesting to most readers, but I will say something about the general situation in Sweden. Mr. Johnson criticized the inclusion of a small political party called the Sweden Democrats (and the major Flemish party the Vlaams Belang from Belgium) in a counter-Jihad conference because they supposedly are “racists.”

My answer would be that I find some of their policies to be reasonable, although I do not necessarily agree with all of them. Besides, I don’t see why we need to agree with people on everything just because we talk to them. The authorities all over the Western world meet with representatives of the Muslim Brotherhood and other radical Islamic groups. Even quite violent groups in Third World countries are considered “freedom fighters” by many Westerners when they fight for their causes. This amounts to saying that meeting with potentially violent groups, as long as they are non-white, is OK, but meeting with non-violent groups who work peacefully within the democratic system is not OK if they stand up for their rights and happen to be white. I do not accept this double standard and refuse to submit to it.

The “white nationalist” label which LGF used is totally meaningless in Europe. Maybe it makes sense in a North American or Australian context, but not in a European one. Yes, native Europeans happen to be born white, and most of us support national sovereignty. But nobody calls Asians, Africans or others who fight for their dignity black, brown or yellow nationalists, so why should we be called white nationalists if we do the same?

Moreover, it’s just plain, factually wrong. Europeans have been waging wars against each other for hundreds of years. There is hardly a spot on European soil where a person cannot stand and say “You did this bad thing to us X number of centuries ago, and we still hate you for it.” We view ourselves as Italians, Norwegians, Poles, Irishmen etc., not as “whites.”

Europeans generally do not wish to eradicate all of our national peculiarities, and the differences between northern and southern, eastern and western Europe are profound. Let us not kid ourselves about that. However, that doesn’t mean that we never have common interests. The irony is that precisely the kind of verbal and physical attacks we are being subjected to now could potentially change things. There is an increasing amount of racist violence targeting whites. And I do mean whites, not Englishmen, Scots, Germans, Czechs, Hungarians, Catholics, Orthodox Christians or atheists. Perhaps if people feel that they are being attacked as whites they will start defending themselves as whites as well. Maybe, if this is a “post-national” age and nation states are undermined by transnational ideologies of various kinds, native Europeans will create a “transnational” ideology of their to defend themselves. This ideology would be dedicated to the defense of a shared European civilization and of the peoples who have historically created it. I don’t foresee that pre-existing national identities can or should disappear completely, but there could be another layer of “Europeanism” added on top of this: Europe as a cultural alliance rather than as a single nation.

As the Baron of Gates of Vienna put it: “Wouldn’t it be ironic if the Multicultural regime imposed by the EU and the UN actually produced that which it fears the most? A newly-forged pan-European nationalist identity,

but one that rejects Multiculturalism, immigration, and Islam. Yet another example of the Law of Unintended Consequences. *For they sow the wind, and they reap the whirlwind...*

Regarding racism: It is perfectly plausible from a scientific point of view to speculate whether biology affects human behavior. If you believe the theory of evolution then the very concept of racism is essentially meaningless. "Racism" doesn't mean anything other than that you recognize that there are genetic differences between groups of people (an undisputed medical fact) and ask whether these differences have practical consequences. It is even a scientifically valid question to ponder whether there is a genetic component to culture. It's unscientific to block any debate of the subject.

I could add that in a traditional society, the worst thing you can be is not a racist but a traitor. We now have a situation where it is good to betray your people whereas those who defend their nation are evil. This needs to be reversed back to normal. We shouldn't have to defend ourselves and say "I'm not a racist, but..." at all. When the Multiculturalists start their sentences with the words "I'm not a traitor to my people, but..." we know we are winning.

Here is a comment by British reader [DP111](#):

"Britain is under a threat, the likes of which it has never been under. If Napoleon or even Hitler, had conquered Britain, most of our British/Western culture, music, art etc would be unscathed. Islam on the other hand will wipe out everything. In the fullness of time, the very presence of Christianity- cathedrals, minsters, abbeys, will be demolished and razed to the ground (re: Bamiyan Buddhas). So grave is the threat to the existence, nay, the very soul of Britain, that it is not possible to rule out any policy to remove the Islam threat, just because it may harm some innocent person or group — racial, religious or secular, or ethnic, no matter how sacred. Besides, all of them can be compensated in some form at a later date, once the Islam threat has been removed. This is an existential war, and innocents will, and are being injured or killed. If this means that we need to suspend parliamentary democracy for the duration — so be it. If it means suspending constitutional monarchy — so be it. If it means banning groups from the realm — so be it. All can be reversed once the danger is eliminated. Besides, there is precedent in British history for all the above."

I remember walking through the Vatican in Rome not too long ago, admiring all the beautiful pictorial art as well as the amazing statues. Nothing like this can or does exist in Islam. All of this priceless art will be destroyed if Islamization continues. It will happen, the only question is when. The cultural treasures of Italy survived Mussolini. The Communists were more destructive than the Fascists when it came to art, but even they didn't destroy all the traditional art within their territory. What we are facing, the combination of Multiculturalism, mass immigration and Islam, constitutes the greatest threat European civilization has ever faced. We will simply cease to exist as distinct peoples forever if we don't defeat this threat.

I warned Johnson and his followers that they relied upon heavily biased information provided by political enemies from countries whose politics they did not understand. Those opposing the official Multicultural policies will automatically be branded as "racists" and "extremists" by the political establishment throughout Western Europe. The state-sponsored organization Expo was treated as a credible source of information by LGF regarding Swedish politics. One of their co-founders, [Tobias Hübinette](#), wrote this in 1996:

-----  
"To feel and even think that the white race is inferior in every conceivable way is natural with regards to its history and current actions. Let the Western countries of the white race perish in blood and suffering. Long live the multicultural, racially mixed and classless ecological society! Long live anarchy!"

According to his CV, Tobias Hübinette worked for Expo until at least 1997. In other words, he continued doing research for this "anti-racist" organization after having publicly advocated the extermination of whites and the violent destruction of an entire civilization. Hübinette has continued promoting "Multiculturalism," even received awards, and was in late 2007 working for the Multicultural Centre of Botkyrka, Sweden. To some, "Multiculturalism" apparently means "death to white people and their culture," nothing more and nothing less.

The founder and editor of Expo magazine from 1995 until his death in November 2004, Stieg Larsson, worked with Hübinette. Larsson left behind three unpublished thrillers which have become major bestsellers after his death, in Sweden and beyond. And by bestsellers I mean a Scandinavian equivalent of the *Da Vinci Code*. I have read several articles in the mainstream media about Larsson's life, and they all left out his collaboration



with Hübnette. Apparently, working with a person calling for the mass murder of your people is of such little significance that it doesn't even deserve to be mentioned in a single sentence.

The EU's official watchdog against "racism" complains that native Europeans do not censor themselves enough. The European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (FRA) is a Vienna-based agency created in 2007 as the successor to the European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia (EUMC). One of the organizations cooperating with FRA is the Swedish left-wing organization Expo, which has been treated as a credible source of information by the European Fundamental Rights Agency regarding "racist violence" in Sweden [ pdf ]. Not only is Expo linked to from the Agency's website, it has received hundreds of thousands of Euros — presumably sponsored by European taxpayers — in direct financial support from the Agency [ pdf ]. Expo takes part in the EU's Raxen network against racism and xenophobia.

I have never seen a single official study tracking the wave of racist violence, rapes, stabbings and murder directed against native Europeans in cities across the continent, at least the western half of it. As the EU is deliberately breaking down existing nation states through mass immigration of alien and sometimes hostile peoples, the EU is to a considerable extent responsible for triggering this wave of racist violence against the indigenous peoples of an entire continent. If the EU wants to fight against racism, it should start with abolishing itself.

The EU spends millions and millions of Euros of European tax money on funding Islamic groups in the Middle East as well as "anti-racist groups" (usually heavily infiltrated by former Communists) across much of Europe. This is done in order to facilitate the creation of Eurabia and harass "racists" who oppose the EU's agenda and desire national sovereignty. The most dangerous thing, however, is the money going the other way, with Arab oil money sponsoring Islamic expansionism and buying corrupt officials and politicians in Western nations.

According to what appeared to be a leaked document from the fall of 2008, Expo has apparently provided some of their material on the Sweden Democrats to the largest political party in the country, the Social Democrats, for use against their political rivals from a legal opposition party which appears to be set to gain seats in parliament during the next elections. I cannot say with certainty whether this document is genuine, but it is not impossible that it is. Expo is treated as a respectable organization by the political class, and their material has been reprinted by leading newspapers *Expressen* and *Aftonbladet*, among others.

Unfortunately, Expo has demonstrated a willingness to "share information" with radical groups of "anti-Fascists" in Antifascistisk Action (AFA). The thugs of AFA in the spring of 2008 destroyed the car of an elderly woman and wrote "nasse" (Nazi) on top of it. As it turned out, they picked the wrong car. Yet years of such attacks against private citizens have not prompted the authorities to crack down on their activities.

Leading newspaper *Aftonbladet* has close ideological ties to the Social Democrats, the country's dominant party for most of the past century. Helle Klein, its political editor-in-chief from 2001 to 2007, during a demonstration organized by Islamic and anti-racist organizations in December 2006 stood in front of a banner which read "A Sweden for all — Stop the Nazi violence" and held a speech warning against Islamophobia in the media. Klein has voiced sympathy for terrorist organization Hamas in her editorials while warning against the threat posed to world peace by Israeli aggression and the Christian Right in the USA. Hamas is a Fascist organization openly calling for mass murder of Jews. Violent attacks against Jews in Europe in 2008 are to an overwhelming degree caused by Muslim immigration, which is encouraged by the EU and the national political elites. The irony of warning against "Nazi violence" while showing sympathy for an organization that wants to finish what the Nazis started apparently doesn't strike Ms. Klein. She still blogged at *Aftonbladet's* website as of early 2008.

One of Klein's fellow columnists at *Aftonbladet*, the long-time Communist Robert Aschberg, is the publisher of Expo magazine. Leading Expo member Charles Westin in October 2007 published the book *Brunt!* ("brown," as in "Fascist"), where he let members of AFA contribute some of their intelligence regarding "right-wing extremists," among them people associated with the legal party the Sweden Democrats. In addition to Mr. Westin, the book was co-authored by Mats Deland, who is a journalist in *Aftonbladet*. Why is it considered OK that a representative of one of Scandinavia's largest newspapers, with ties to the country's largest political party, thus associates himself openly with an organization known for physically assaulting members of a legal opposition party, even in their private homes?

Before the elections in 2006, the established parties cooperated in boycotting the Sweden Democrats and other “xenophobic” parties. In one of many similar incidents, which extreme Leftists bragged about on the Internet, around 30 members of the SD were attacked during a peaceful, private party outside the town of Växjö. The brave “anti-Fascists” threw tear gas into the building, forcing people outside where they were beaten with iron bars and axes. Open, aggressive and sometimes violent harassment of critics of the country’s immigration policies has been going on for years while the authorities have largely turned a blind eye to the problem. Still, the SD’s press spokesman Jonas Åkerlund has said such attacks have become less common, and in 2008 the party does seem to be treated slightly better.

Seemingly encouraged by the silence from the establishment to political violence, extreme Leftists have stepped up their attacks to include mainstream parties, such as the Centre Party’s offices in Stockholm. Newspaper *Expressen* warned against the “low-intensity terrorism” conducted by extreme Leftists and neo-Nazis. But they were honest enough to admit that the extreme Leftists have tended to get away with their violence because it has been directed against despised right-wingers. Political scientist Peter Esaiasson has done research into every election movement in Sweden since 1866. According to him, the organized attempts at disrupting meetings during the 2006 elections have no parallels in modern history.

AFA are Marxists and convinced that progress can only be made through violent struggle: “If we want to fight against capitalism, the working class needs to be united, and in order to be so intolerance cannot be tolerated. However, if we want to fight against intolerance we have to defeat capitalism as an extension of that struggle. Hence anti-fascism, feminism and the struggle against homophobia go hand in hand with the class struggle!”

If you protest against Muslim immigration, you suffer from Islamophobia, which is almost the same as xenophobia, which is almost the same as racism. And racists are almost Fascists and Nazis, as we all know, and they shouldn’t be allowed to voice their opinions in public. Hence, if you protest against being assaulted or raped by immigrants, you are evil and need to be silenced. Natives who object to a mass immigration that will render them a minority in their own country within a couple of generations have already been classified as “racists,” and racists are for all practical purposes outside of the protection of the law. According to [Politikerbloggen](#), AFA have produced a manual about how to use violence in order to paralyze and hurt their opponents, and they encourage their members to study it closely.

The “respectable,” state-funded organization Antirasistisk Senter, the Antiracist Center in Norway, at their home page as of 2008 [link](#) to AFA Stockholm, which they call “militant Swedish anti-Fascists.” So they know that they are “militant,” but not so much that they won’t link to them. They also link to Antifaschistische Aktion (AFA) in Berlin, some of whose members were probably among the brave “anti-Fascists” who assaulted “racist” old ladies and Jewish “Nazis” during the peaceful anti-Islamization demonstration in Cologne, Germany in September 2008. The other organizations mentioned indicate that these are recommended and not just “relevant” links. This is met with silence from the mass media and the political class.

The girlfriend of a politician from the Sweden Democrats was attacked at her home outside Stockholm. The young woman was found bound with [duct tape](#) in the apartment block where she lives with Martin Kinnunen, chairman of the youth wing of the SD. Three men had forced their way into the couple’s apartment and held the 19-year-old at knife point. Kinnunen tells of several threats and anonymous phone calls to the family. He blames the [media](#) for systematically portraying the SD as monsters and thus for legitimizing aggression against them, and claims that the Swedish democracy is a sham.

*text14*|News website *The Local* states that members of the only significant (but still small) party in Sweden critical of mass immigration live under constant threat of violence. Sweden is witnessing the greatest explosion of street violence in its history, and a woman is raped every two hours. Expo, which is backed by the media and the major parties, has been campaigning against the Sweden Democrats for years. Daniel Poohl from the unelected organization Expo states that it’s “not undemocratic” to deny the SD access to political influence.

According to Jonathan Friedman, an American working in Sweden for years, “no debate about immigration policies is possible, the subject is simply avoided. Sweden has such a close connection between the various powerful groups, politicians, journalists, etc. The political class is closed, isolated.” The elites are worried to see their power slip away and therefore want to silence critics, for instance the Sweden Democrats, a small

party opposed to immigration: “It is a completely legal party, they just aren’t allowed to speak....In reality, the basis of democracy has been completely turned on its head. It is said: ‘Democracy is a certain way of thinking, a specific set of opinions, and if you do not share them, then you aren’t democratic, and then we condemn you and you ought to be eliminated. The People? That is not democratic. We the Elite, we are democracy.’ It is grotesque and it certainly has nothing to do with democracy, more like a kind of moral dictatorship.”

As Bruce Bawer writes in the article [While Sweden Slept](#): “Sweden Democrats have been the targets of events that recall China’s Cultural Revolution. Staged ‘people’s protests’ by members of the ‘youth divisions’ of other parties have led to the firing of Sweden Democrats from their jobs. A few weeks ago, a junior diplomat was dismissed when it became known that he was a member of the party and had criticized his country’s immigration policy. On several occasions, thugs loyal to the ruling parties have broken up SD meetings and beaten up party leaders.”

A judge who hears migration appeals had his house vandalized by left-wing extremists. Threats were sprayed on the walls, red paint was poured over the steps and an axe was left outside his home. “When a judge in a Swedish court has his home vandalized in this way, it is of course very serious,” said Ingvar Paulsson, head of the Gothenburg District Administrative Court. The group Antifascistisk Action (AFA) wrote on [its homepage](#) that the attack was motivated by the plight of Iraqi asylum seekers. The Swedish Board of Migration has ruled that they should be deported if they cannot show that a threat exists against them personally.

Sweden alone in 2006 accepted almost [as many](#) asylum applications from Iraqis as all other European countries did combined. Native Swedes, who live in a country which was one of the most ethnically homogeneous nations in the world only 30 years ago, will be a minority in their own country within a few decades if current trends continue. Sweden is self-destructing at a pace which is unprecedented in history (although other Western nations are trying hard to beat them to it), but for the extreme Left, even this isn’t fast enough.

I have seen a TV program from the city of Malmö, the third-largest in Sweden, where a veiled Muslim girl told how much she loved it there; it was just like some Arab city. A large proportion of the incoming Iraqis have settled in Södertälje, which vies with the soon-to-be majority Muslim Malmö as the town with the highest percentage of social [welfare](#) recipients. However, in Södertälje there is a much larger amount of Assyrian Christians. Interestingly enough, the native population are still harassed by immigrant gangs. This demonstrates that sometimes this is not about Jihad; it’s about racist violence against the white population by various immigrant groups from developing countries. Consequently, the only way to stop this is to halt or severely limit all mass immigration, not just Muslim immigration.

In the fall of 2008, a girl in Södertälje was brutally assaulted and [beaten](#) unconscious (they continued beating her even after she was unconscious) by a group of more than twenty armed young men dressed in black. The attackers were immigrants (which the newspaper [article](#) actually stated; Swedish media usually don’t mention this if a crime involves immigrant perps) and screamed “f\*\*king Swedish whore!” while they beat the girl and her friend and kicked her while she was lying on the ground. The good news is that another group of five young men (native Swedes) intervened. That took real courage since they were unarmed and greatly outnumbered. They got badly beaten up but probably saved the girl’s life.

As blogger [Baron](#) says, “What makes Södertälje unusual is that most of the immigrants causing trouble are not Muslims, but Assyrian Christians. The example of Södertälje highlights the fact that the issue in Sweden and other parts of Europe is not just Muslim immigration, but *all* mass immigration, especially from the Third World. Even though the Assyrians are Christians, like their Muslim counterparts they have brought with them violence, crime, the disinclination to assimilate, and a widespread disregard for the laws and customs of their adopted country. These are hard lessons to learn, but it’s important to see the problem clearly: mass immigration into a country tends to cause disruption of civil society and lawlessness. It also tends to erode respect for the authority of the state, on the part of immigrants and natives alike.”

Swedish blogger Daniel Eriksson has made a report from Södertälje, which is one of the towns in Sweden with the highest portion of immigrants. A very large number of them are Christian Assyrians, who have clans and even run their own courts:

“Mafia-like criminal networks, many of the members of which are Assyrians, threaten policemen, officials, and small businesses. In classic mafia style, restaurants are offered ‘protection’. Professional criminals work at the entrance, which enables them control how much money comes in and to take what share they want. An alcohol inspector got a bomb put on the outside of his car. Threats are regularly issued against policemen — ‘your house will be burnt down, we know where you live’, etc. It is generally believed that the fact that the Assyrian group is so dominant it a major reason for the problems. In more diverse multicultural areas, people don’t stick as much to one another as the Assyrians do in Södertälje. The diversity makes it less easy for criminals to co-operate, less easy to construct a parallel justice system, and people are also more prone to integrate into Swedish society. The Assyrians in Södertälje don’t need that; they have set up their own self-contained society in Södertälje.”

Following the September 2006 election, Fredrik Reinfeldt became Prime Minister of Sweden, presiding over a centre-right coalition government. This is, in my view, positive. Sweden has been described as a “one-party state,” since the Social Democrats had been in power for 65 of the previous 74 years and had more or less merged with the big labor unions and some government agencies. It is healthy that other parties are in power for a while.

However, the differences between the left-wing and the right-wing in Sweden are not always that big. The last time these parties were in power, under the leadership of PM Carl Bildt from the Swedish “conservative” party in the early 1990s, they presided over massive immigration, and have not been vocal in their opposition to the immigration policies since. Bildt, now Foreign Minister in Reinfeldt’s government, as a UN Commissioner to the Balkans called for recognizing Islam as a part of European culture. These parties are slightly more sensible in economic policies than the Social Democrats, but not much better when it comes to Multiculturalism. Mass immigration continues at full speed.

The “conservative” PM Reinfeldt has stated that the traditional Swedish culture was merely barbarism. He said this following a visit to an area called Ronna in Södertälje, near Stockholm. In an earlier incident, a police station in Södertälje was hit by shots from an automatic weapon following a confrontation between immigrant youths and police. Apart from police staff, two civilian Swedish women were in the police station. They were being questioned about harassment earlier in the day. Three young men who had been identified by the women were suspected of making illegal threats. The three men were released in the evening, but the arrests provoked strong reactions. A group of immigrants advanced on the police and attacked them with stones. The trouble in Ronna started after a native Swedish girl had been called a “whore” by some immigrants and she reacted to this.

Such incidents are part of the increasingly extreme sexual and physical violence targeting native whites by immigrant gangs. This is way beyond just “crime,” it can hardly be labeled anything other than ethnic warfare. It has been met with almost total silence from the “anti-racist” organizations, many of which are dominated by white Marxists more than by immigrants. They appear to be totally uninterested in racism against their own people, and indirectly encourage it by telling immigrants that they face a system of repressive “white racism” designed to hold them down, thus whipping up hatred against whites.

Expo has ties to extreme left-wing organizations. For instance, one member of their staff in 2008, Kenny Hjalte, was until recently an active member of the Left Party, the “reformed” Communist party. Just how “reformed” this party is has been a matter of controversy. Their leader Lars Ohly called himself a “Leninist” as late as 1999, a decade after the fall of the Berlin Wall. Following media exposure regarding his party’s links with the repressive Communist regimes of Eastern Europe during the Cold War, he said that he would no longer call himself a Communist but still supported the Marxist ideals of a classless society.

The seminar “Arguments against the Sweden Democrats” in October 2007 was moderated by a person representing *Internationalen*, the newspaper of *Socialistiska partiet*, the representatives of Trotskyist Communists in Sweden. It was co-organized by *Arbetaren* (“The Worker”), a Socialist newspaper, with Kajsa Lindohf from Expo and journalist Mats Deland from major newspaper *Aftonbladet* as participants. Several prominent Swedes have a background from *Arbetaren*, among them the author Liza Marklund. She cooperates professionally with the writer Jan Guillou, whose story about the fictional character Arn Magnusson, placed during the Crusades (with a heavy anti-Christian and pro-Islamic bias), in 2007 was turned into the most expensive film production in Scandinavian history.



Jan Guillou refused to honor the victims of the Jihadist attacks of September 11, 2001 with three minutes of silence because the attacks were “an attack on U.S. imperialism.” Responding to a study showing a vastly disproportionate amount of Left Party (former Communist party) supporters among journalists, the Socialist Jan Guillou admitted that “The statistics are true.” Guillou has boasted about the fact that unlike their neighbors, Sweden doesn’t have a significant political party critical of mass immigration. This is, according to him, because the intellectuals have stuck together to prevent such “Islamophobia and racism” from gaining ground. It is curious that he brags about curtailing freedom of speech regarding mass immigration, since from 2000 to 2004 he was the chairman of the Swedish Publicists’ Association, which is supposedly dedicated to free speech in the mass media.

To give some perspective on just how biased the Swedish political and media establishment is, here is a blog post from February 2008 by the Scandinavia-based American writer Bruce Bawer, author of the international bestseller While Europe Slept:

“*Dagens Nyheter*, Sweden’s largest newspaper, contains a piece by Andreas Malm about *While Europe Slept*, Bat Ye’or’s *Eurabia*, Walter Laqueur’s *Last Days of Europe*, and Mark Steyn’s *America Alone*. (But mostly about *While Europe Slept*.) It’s more of the usual mischief: instead of seriously addressing the facts and analyses in these books, Malm is regally dismissive and derisive, relentlessly mocking the authors and caricaturing their arguments.”

Who is Mr. Malm? According to Bawer he’s “a former member of Syndicalist Youth (no, it’s not a Swedish boy band), a regular contributor to a syndicalist weekly called *Arbetaren*, and a founder of the Swedish branch of the International Solidarity Movement. A couple of years ago he wrote a piece for *Expressen* explaining why he supports Hizbollah. In this corner of the world, it’s only par for the course for a major newspaper to invite a person with such a résumé to write about books like *While Europe Slept*.”

The Syndicalist Youth see themselves as a part of the “revolutionary Left” and champion a “stateless and classless” society. They are supporters of the Palestinian intifada because it “shows the way for the millions of workers in the West and for us revolutionaries who are fighting in the heart” of “US-led imperialism.” As Norwegian journalist Jens Tomas Anfindsen notes, it is difficult to believe that a person with a history of revolutionary activism could be awarded a job in this “paper of record” unless they knew about his background and maybe considered it an asset. *Dagens Nyheter* is a “center-right” newspaper by local standards. A supporter of the Islamic terrorist organization Hizbollah and of a global stateless world thus gets to write about “Islamophobia” in a leading “conservative” newspaper.

In contrast, Lennart Eriksson worked at the Swedish Migration Board for more than 20 years. In 2007 he was ousted from his job as unit manager, allegedly because he ran a website in which he gave his opinions on various issues and because he is a political Conservative and pro-Israeli. On his website, he voiced appreciation of the US and Israel as thriving democracies and praised US general Patton as a hero of World War Two. He never spent work-time on his website and never used his work computers for this purpose. Neither do his employers contend that he ever did so. Eriksson sued the Migration Board. He maintains he has in effect been fired from his job as asylum assessment unit manager, camouflaged in the form of a transfer, and feels that there is no legal or justifiable cause for the move. The Migration Board confirms that Lennart Eriksson has been transferred as a result of the opinions he expressed on his private website. The case will be settled in October 2008, but as far as I know, it was not yet resolved when this book was completed, on October 13 2008.

In Sweden, you risk your job if you are a pro-Israeli, pro-American conservative or an “Islamophobe,” but ridiculing Christianity or supporting Islamic terrorist organizations is OK; it may even enhance your career prospects. Criticizing Multiculturalism and mass immigration will not only make you lose your job (there have been several cases of this), but could make you a victim of physical attacks, perhaps in your private home.

At the same time as Eriksson’s case was scheduled for court, Swedish Academy supremo Horace Engdahl denounced the “ignorance” of authors from the United States and claimed that the reason why not many Nobel Prizes for Literature are awarded to Americans is that Europeans are more open-minded. Americans “don’t really participate in the big dialogue” of ideas. Which dialogue is he referring to? The only dialogue self-appointed intellectuals in his country are interested in is with hardline Marxists, Islamic Jihadists and others who believe Western civilization is evil and should be destroyed.



When Andreas Malm wrote about the “Islamophobia” of Bruce Bawer, Bat Ye’or and Canadian writer Mark Steyn, he was echoing an article written by Expo. In late 2007 Expo released the publication [ [pdf](#), in Swedish] “The war against Islam,” in which they worried about an increasing trend towards “organized Islamophobia” in the West. They specifically singled out [the Brussels anti-Jihad conference](#) of October 2007 for attention, and compared criticism of Communism, which has killed perhaps one hundred million people, to criticism of Islam. Expo’s founder Stieg Larsson was pro-Communist and met his future wife during a support meeting for the pro-Communist National Front for the Liberation of South Vietnam.

As we speak, Muslims are [driving Christians](#) out of the birthplace of Jesus Christ, Bethlehem, but Western media choose to blame this on the Jewish state of Israel, a fellow victim of Jihad. The Christian population [has dwindled](#) from more than 85 per cent in 1948 to 12 per cent of its inhabitants in 2006. The few remaining non-Muslim communities in the Middle East are being [systematically eradicated](#). Overall, the Middle Eastern Christian population has dropped from 20 percent in 1900 to less than 2 percent today, and is declining by the day. Why do “anti-racists” hardly write a single word about global Muslim infidelophobia when they are so concerned about Islamophobia?

On the International Women’s Day, March 8 2008, the columnist Marte Michelet in left-wing Multicultural Norwegian newspaper *Dagbladet* attacked “brown” Feminists. And no, by that she did not mean Feminists with a dark skin, but those championing “Fascist,” racist and Islamophobic forces, which she took to mean virtually the same thing. One of them would be Hege Storhaug from the organization Human Rights Service, who has worked for the rights of immigrant women. After Ms. Michelet got many angry responses from readers who are fed-up with Islam, she wrote another [article](#) arguing that “Islamophobia is the most dangerous ideology of our time” and referred to Expo’s work in Sweden. According to her, “The amateur historian Bat Ye’or [is] the author of the Islamophobic Bible, the book *Eurabia*, which warns of a Muslim conspiracy against Europe. The book is probably as trustworthy as the anti-Semitic idea of the Jewish conspiracy ZOG.”

Columnist Marte Michelet is the daughter of the Communist writer Jon Michelet and was until 1998 the leader of the Red Youth, the country’s “revolutionary youth league.” For my part, I find it very interesting how many Marxist Feminists, who have for generations worked to break down Christianity and the nuclear family in the West, now passionately embrace Islam, the most repressive religion on earth. Marxists do not care about “women’s liberty.” They do not care about anybody’s liberty. They support anything that can destabilize the West. The fact that a newspaper that has been at the forefront of radical Feminism for generations now suddenly warns against “Islamophobia” and “prejudice” against the world’s most anti-female religion is highly revealing.

Ethnologist Maria Bäckman, in her study “Whiteness and gender,” has followed a group of Swedish girls in the suburb of Rinkeby outside Stockholm, where natives have been turned into a minority of the inhabitants due to immigration. The subjects “may encounter prejudices such as the idea that Swedish girls [act and dress](#) in a sexually provocative way or that blonde girls are easy.” Bäckman relates that several of the Swedish girls she interviewed stated that they had dyed their hair to avoid sexual harassment. They experienced that being blonde involves old men staring at you, cars honking their horns and boys calling you “whore.”

A report from organization Save the Children told that Swedish girls are scared of being raped, a possibility that appears very real to them. A survey carried out among ninth-grade boys in the immigrant-dominated suburb of Rinkeby showed that in the last year, 17% of the boys had forced someone to have sex, 31% had hurt someone so badly that the victim required medical care, and 24% had committed burglary or broken into a car. Sensational statistics, but they appear to have been published only in a daily newsheet that is distributed free on the subways.

“It is not as wrong raping a Swedish girl as raping an Arab girl,” says Hamid, in an interview about a gang rape involving a Swedish girl and immigrant perps. “The Swedish girl gets a lot of help afterwards, and she had probably f\*\*ked before, anyway. But the Arab girl will get problems with her family. For her, being raped is a source of shame. It is important that she retains her virginity....It is far too easy to get a Swedish whore...girl, I mean,” says Hamid, and laughs over his own choice of words. “I don’t have too much respect for Swedish girls. I guess you can say they get f\*\*ked to pieces.”

In an article from June 2007 with the title “Summertime — rape time,” *Aftonbladet*, one of the largest dailies in Scandinavia, linked the spike in rapes during the summer to the warm weather. The official number of rape charges in Sweden has more than quadrupled during one generation, even more for girls under the age of 15. If this is due to the warm weather, I suppose the Scandinavian rape wave is caused by global warming? The fact that a greatly disproportionate number of the suspects have an immigrant background according to statistics from neighboring Norway and Denmark is purely coincidental, no doubt.

According to journalist Karen Jespersen, Helle Klein, the political editor-in-chief of *Aftonbladet* from 2001 to 2007 and a former leading member of the Social Democratic Youth League, has stated that “If the debate is [about] that there are problems caused by refugees and immigrants, we don’t want it.” Opinion polls have revealed that two out of three Swedes doubt whether Islam can be combined with Swedish society, yet not one party in parliament has been genuinely critical of the immigration policies.

The rape numbers are being heavily manipulated by the authorities and the media, who claim that the massive increase in rapes is caused by:

- A. The warm weather
- B. Alcohol,
- C. Internet dating sites, and
- D. A technical increase due to the fact that women suddenly report rape more frequently than before.

These are the explanations that are mentioned. There is no other. Suggesting that it has something to do with mass immigration of alien and aggressive cultures is quite literally banned by law. In March 2007 during a rally supported by SSU, the Social Democratic Youth League, a man carried a sign reading, “While Swedish girls are being gang raped by immigrant gangs the SSU is fighting racism.” He was promptly arrested and later sentenced to a fine because he “expressed disrespect for a group of people with reference to their national or ethnic background.” The local court rejected the man’s free speech argument because even free speech has its limits, and he had clearly acted in a too provocative manner.

In September 2008, while an anti-Islamization demonstration was interrupted in Germany, clashes between police and demonstrators broke out as Malmö played host to the European Social Forum, with assorted groups of international left-wingers. Rocks were thrown at the police, windows were broken and a woman was raped as 800 people demonstrated against climate change. One group of Leftist blackhoods carried a banner with the inscription: *Yes we are dreamers, Yes we believe in socialism, But we are more numerous than you think, and we have weapons. AFA Youth Malmö* (AFA=Antifascistisk Aktion). This is a group which has assaulted critics of immigration for years, even judges and public officials, yet they can demonstrate openly in the streets and brag about how well armed they are. That doesn’t mean that free speech doesn’t have its limits. It clearly does.

Dahn Pettersson, a local politician, has been fined 18,000 kronor for writing that 95 percent of all heroin brought in comes via Albanians from Kosovo. “It is never ethnic groups that commit crimes. It is individuals or groups of individuals,” prosecutor Mats Svensson told the court, which found Pettersson guilty of “Agitation Against a Minority Group.” Svante Nycander, former editor of daily *Dagens Nyheter*, stated that “the ruling in Malmö District Court is damaging to freedom of expression. Many will take it as proof that the authorities are afraid of uncomfortable truths, and that lacking reasoned counter-arguments they punish those who speak plainly.” In Sweden, saying that Muslim Albanians are behind much of the drug traffic in Europe (a fact) is a crime. Making derogatory statements about the native population, however, is just fine.

Feriz and Pajtim, members of the group Gangsta Albanian Thug Unit in Malmö, explain to a journalist how they mug people downtown. They target a lone victim. “We surround him and beat and kick him until he no longer fights back,” Feriz says. They are always many more people than their victims. Isn’t this cowardly? “I have heard that from many, but I disagree. The whole point is that they’re not supposed to have a chance.” They don’t express any sympathy for their victims. “If they get injured, they just have themselves to blame for being weak,” says Pajtim and shrugs. “Many of us took part in gangs which fought against the Serbs in Kosovo. We have violence in our blood.” They blame the politicians for why they are mugging, stating that they are

bored. If the state could provide them with something to do, maybe they would stop attacking people. But is a lack of leisure pursuits the only reason why they assault people? “No, it’s good fun as well,” says Feriz.

The wave of robberies the city of Malmö has experienced is part of a “war against Swedes.” This is the explanation given by young robbers from an immigrant background in interviews conducted by sociologist Petra Åkesson: “When we are in the city and robbing we are waging a war, waging a war against the Swedes. Power for me means that the Swedes shall look at me, lie down on the ground and kiss my feet. We rob every single day, as often as we want to, whenever we want to.”

Swedish authorities have virtually done nothing to stop this. On the contrary, they continue the policies that created these problems and ban opposition to this as “racism.” Sweden has absolutely no public debate about mass immigration, yet the natives are victims of an unprecedented wave of violence. While this is going on, the number one priority for the political class is demonizing neighboring Denmark for its “brutal” and “xenophobic” debate about immigration. During the immigrant riots in France in 2005, the Social Democratic Prime Minister Göran Persson criticized the way the French handled the unrest: “It feels like a very hard and confrontational approach.” He rejected the idea of more local police in Sweden. “To start sending out signals about strengthening the police is to break with the political line we have chosen to follow,” he said.

Police officers in 2007 protested against a new uniform designed to make them appear less aggressive by replacing boots with shoes, making guns less visible and changing the shirts to a softer, gentler color. Jan Karlson from the Swedish Police Union warns that the underfunded police force will not be able to keep up with organized crime and rising levels of ethnic tensions for much longer. Meanwhile, Sweden has all but abolished its armed forces. According to Professor Wilhelm Agrell, Sweden now has a security policy based on the assumption that national territorial defense is no longer needed. The few soldiers they do have are stationed in faraway places.

Don’t Swedes pay famously high tax rates? Yes, they do. But tens of billions of kroner are spent on propping up rapidly growing communities of immigrants. Sweden has become the entire world’s welfare office and its celebrated welfare state the world’s largest pyramid scheme, an Enron with a national flag. The Danish People’s Party have suggested that Denmark should limit the right to settle in other Nordic countries and claim benefits because they fear that the Swedish welfare state could break down due to immigration, triggering a flood of welfare tourists to neighboring countries. “Sweden will have to make dramatic cuts in social security benefits unless they want their welfare system to come crashing down,” says Søren Espersen from the DPP.

In the New York Times May 10, 2006, Alan Cowell wrote an article from Sweden entitled “An Economy With Safety Features, Sort of Like a Volvo.” In all fairness, Mr. Cowell does mention potential problems, not the least that massive immigration is rapidly changing what was once a very ethnically homogeneous nation state. Still, he concludes that “the economy prospers — even though taxes here remain high and big government administers cradle-to-grave social programs that absorb more than half of the national output” and that “compared with some other parts of Europe, there is still some optimism here.”

This is sloppy journalism. Cowell states that “Sweden’s official unemployment rate of 4.8 percent, many economists say, is distorted by the omission of people in government-financed retraining programs. The labor unions calculate the real figure at closer to 8 percent.” In fact, some Swedes have suggested that true unemployment was more in the ballpark of 20-25%. In June 2006, think tank McKinsey Global Institute claimed that Sweden’s real unemployment rate was 15 percent, and that “If nothing else changes, the resulting increase in welfare costs would become too large to finance through the current tax system in only 10 to 20 years.”

500,000 people are on early retirement, 68,000 of whom are between the ages of 20 and 40. “If the sick-leave levels in Sweden really were an indicator of how sick we are, we would be facing a plague here,” as one commentator put it. Johnny Munkhammar of free market think-tank Timbro thinks the Scandinavian model is not all it’s cracked up to be. Sweden had the second highest growth rate in the world from 1890 to 1950, but since the tax rate later rose drastically it has fallen behind. It was the fourth richest country per capita in the world in 1970 whereas now it is number 14, and falling.

More immigrants should be allowed in to safeguard the welfare system, said finance minister Pär Nuder in

2005. However, unofficial estimates indicate that immigration costs at least 40 to 50 billion Swedish kroner every year, probably much more. A cost of 225 billion kroner in 2004, which is a high but not impossible estimate, would equal 17.5% of the tax income in a country where the overall tax burden between 1990 and 2005 on average was 61%. Exact numbers are impossible to come by, as the authorities refuse to make such calculations out of fear that it would contribute to “racism and xenophobia.”

Parallel with mass immigration from Third World countries, more people are leaving Sweden than at any time since the late 19th century. This trend is similar to that of the Netherlands, Germany, Britain and other countries where well-educated natives leave while they are being displaced by immigrants from developing countries. This policy of population replacement clearly cannot be economically beneficial to the countries in question. It is difficult to see any other logic behind this policy than a desire to crush existing Western nation states by all means necessary. In the 19th century Swedes left because of poverty. In the 21st they leave because their country is systematically being taken away from them by their own authorities.

Doesn't this mean that the Swedish state and its elites are indirectly responsible for driving their own people away from their homes? I think it does, and I think future generations will view this policy as an example of pure evil. I also think they will find it difficult to understand how those who are vilified could in this case be the majority population, not a minority. There are several reasons for this, but I find it hard to believe whether this would have been possible without the incessant demonization of people of European origins and their culture that has become an established part of the mainstream ideology in many countries.

An unofficial survey among 52 Swedish municipalities indicated that at least 114 cases of arson against schools were registered within the first half of 2006, but accurate numbers were hard to come by. At least 139 schools suffered attempted arson during 2002 alone. Firefighter Björn Vinberg from the Malmö area says it is degrading to put out fires again and again in the same immigrant areas, with school kids laughing at them and lighting a new one just afterwards. No doubt, this must be a protest against the institutionalized and pervasive racism in Swedish society. By 2008, firefighters in Malmö demand police escorts on calls. They have had enough of threats in some of the city's rougher areas. The firemen were attacked twice in a week during calls to the Muslim-dominated Rosengård suburb. In one case a “youth” pelted a fireman with stones, while another was attacked by a barrage of raw eggs. None of this has discouraged the political elites from continuing mass immigration, however.

Writer Nima Sanandaji states that “The Social Democratic party has started fishing for votes with the help of radical Muslims clergies.” They have been working with the influential Muslim leader Mahmoud Aldebe, president of Sweden's Muslim Association, which is widely believed to be inspired by the Muslim Brotherhood. In 1999 Aldebe proposed that sharia should be introduced in Sweden. The Social Democrat Ola Johansson has referred to the book *Social Justice in Islam* by Muslim Brotherhood member and influential Jihadist ideologue Sayyid Qutb as proof that Socialist ideology can find common ground with Islamic ideas. After the elections in 2002, the Muslim Association sent a congratulation letter to the re-elected Social Democratic Prime Minister Göran Persson, hoping that his party would work for implementing some of their sharia demands in the future.

In 2006, the Muslim Association demanded in a letter, signed by its leader Aldebe, separate family laws regulating marriage and divorce, public schools with imams teaching homogeneous classes of Muslim children their religion and the language of their original homeland, and a “mosque in every municipality to be built through interest-free loans made available by the local municipalities.” This to demonstrate “Islam's right to exist in Sweden” and to “heighten the status of and respect towards Muslims.” The demands were rejected by the Social Democrats then, but we shouldn't be surprised if we see calls for the use of sharia in family matters by this “feminist” party. The British Labour Party has already accepted this.

In 2007 Broderskapsrörelsen (“The Brotherhood”), an organization of Christian members of the Social Democratic Party, decided to establish a network for cooperation with people of other faiths, which largely seemed to mean Muslims. The Social Democrats narrowly lost the elections in 2006 and appear to have decided that the way to regain and maintain power is to import voters; a strategy adopted by many of their sister parties in Western Europe.

According to journalist Salam Karam, “For the Muslim Brotherhood, Sweden is in many ways an ideal country, [and it] shares the ideals of the Social Democrats in their view of the welfare society. Leading figures in



Muslim congregations are also active within the Social Democratic [Party], and have very good relations with Sweden's Christian Social Democrats — Broderskapsrörelsen. The Social Democrats have, in turn, and perhaps as thanks for the support they receive from the mosque leadership, shown a tendency to shy away from the fact that there is extremism in some of our mosques. This has given the Muslim Brotherhood the freedom to force its ideology upon [the mosque's worshippers].”

The Swedish Social Democrats were pro-Fascist and pro-Nazi during the 1930s and 40s, appeased the Communists during the Cold War and cooperate with radical Islamic organizations today. They have consistently supported or appeased some of the worst societies and ideologies in human history. Yet they are the good guys, the poster boys of the political Left throughout the world.

Why do they get away with this? How come Socialists can ally themselves openly with some of the most violent and repressive movements on earth and still manage to portray themselves as beacons of goodness? I am tempted to agree with former Soviet dissident [Vladimir Bukovsky](#): The West didn't win the Cold War, at least not as decisively as we should have done. The belief-system we were up against has been allowed to mutate and [regain some of its former strength](#). We haven't defeated Socialism (or Multiculturalism) until we stage a Nuremberg trial and demonstrate clearly that the suffering, repression and massacres by regimes from Vietnam via the Ukraine to the Baltic were a direct result of Socialist doctrines.

Many former Marxists have become passionate Multiculturalists, so much so that we need to analyze what these doctrines have in common. How come so many white Marxists are aggressively hostile to their own civilization and almost seem to derive pleasure from the idea of wiping out their own people? Is Globalist Multiculturalism on some level a replacement Communism or is it in fact a direct continuation of Communism? In traditional Communism the “oppressive class” should be forced out of power, stripped of their assets and perhaps physically eliminated. If we assume that whites, and by that I mean people of European stock, are seen collectively as the “global oppressive class” who uphold the capitalist system and prevent a just world order, breaking down whites becomes the road to implement equality. Perhaps if traditional Communism put its emphasis on economic differences, this new form of Communism puts emphasis on breaking down cultural and genetic differences in order to achieve global equality. It could thus be thought of as cultural and genetic Communism.

If we assume that the ideology of Globalist Multiculturalism has totalitarian tendencies, we should remember that totalitarian ideologies usually have a Villain Class, a group of evil oppressors that can be blamed for all the ills of society. If the ruling ideology falls somewhat short of producing the Perfect Society it has promised, this will be followed by even more passionate attacks on the Villain Class, be that the Jews, the capitalists, the bourgeoisie, etc. The Villain Class of Multiculturalism seems to be European culture and persons who happen to be born with a white skin. Any problems will automatically be blamed on “white racism.” One of the hallmarks of a Villain Class is that its members can be verbally or even physically abused with impunity. The Villain Class is subject to public scorn and has de facto or de jure less legal protection than other groups.

The radical feminist Joanna Rytel wrote an article called “I Will Never Give Birth to a White Man,” for the Swedish daily *Aftonbladet*, stating things such as “no white men, please... I just puke on them.” After receiving a complaint because of this, Swedish state prosecutor Göran Lambertz explained why this didn't qualify as racism: “The purpose behind the law against incitement of ethnic hatred was to ensure legal protection for minority groups of different compositions and followers of different religions. Cases where people express themselves in a critical or derogatory way about men of ethnic Swedish background were not intended to be included in this law.”

In 2006, Chancellor of Justice [Göran Lambertz](#) discontinued his preliminary investigation regarding anti-Semitism at the great mosque in Stockholm. He wrote that “the lecture at hand contains statements that are strongly degrading to Jews, among other things, they are throughout called brothers of apes and pigs.” Furthermore a curse is expressed over the Jews and “Jihad is called for, to kill the Jews, whereby suicide bombers — celebrated as martyrs — are the most effective weapon.” Lambertz thought that the “recently mentioned statements in spite of their contents are not to be considered incitement against an ethnic group according to Swedish law.” His conclusions were that the preliminary investigation should be discontinued because this incitement against Jews could be said to originate from the Middle East conflict.

It is illegal to suggest that certain groups are worse than others. If you criticize oppression of women, you



should be careful to state that all men are equally bad and that Western men are at least as bad as Muslim men. The Marxist politician (from the “reformed” Communists) Gudrun Schyman in a 2002 speech posited that Swedish men were just like the extremely brutal Islamic Taliban regime. A male columnist in newspaper *Aftonbladet* immediately agreed with her: Yes, Western men are like the Taliban.

A note to Ms. Schyman: A feminist culture will eventually be squashed because the men have either become too demoralized and weakened to protect their women, or because they have become fed-up with incessant ridicule. If Western men are pigs and “just like the Taliban” no matter what we do, why bother? Western women will then be squashed by more aggressive men from other cultures (whom women often voted to let in because of their “kind and compassionate” Socialist sympathies), which is exactly what is happening in Western Europe now. The irony is that when women launched the Second Wave of Feminism in the 1960s and 70s, they were reasonably safe and, in my view, not very oppressed. When the long-term effects of feminism finally set in, Western women may very well end up being genuinely oppressed under the boot of Islam. Radical feminism thus leads to oppression of women.

In 2005, a TV program which caused some stir quoted Irene von Wachenfeldt, chairwoman of ROKS, The National Organization for Women’s Shelters, as saying: “...when war breaks out, it is fully ok to use violence openly. I sometimes say that we are involved in a civil world war, a gender war. Men are animals.” In the organization’s magazine, the extreme feminist Valeria Solana was hailed in a review. She writes in her manifesto: “To call a man an animal is to flatter him: He is a machine, a walking dildo, a biological mishap.” In the TV documentary, Irene von Wachenfeldt was asked whether she agreed with Solana, and she did. ROKS has received millions in public funding.

In Sweden, you cannot say that certain ethnic groups are more involved in crime than others. That’s hateful and banned by law. But you can say that all men are animals, and you will get state support for doing so. You can also belittle the traditional culture of the natives. This is not just allowed but encouraged. As mentioned before, the “conservative” Prime Minister Reinfeldt has stated that the native culture was merely barbarism and that everything good has been imported from abroad. Had a public figure said something similar about the culture of an immigrant group, he or she would have had to resign immediately and most likely would have faced a trial for hate speech and racism.

Jonathan Friedman, an American Jew living in Sweden, mentions that the so-called Integration Act from 1997, two years after Sweden joined the European Union, proclaimed that “Sweden is a Multicultural society.” The Act implicitly states that Sweden doesn’t have a history, only the various ethnic groups that live there now. Native Swedes have formally been reduced to just another ethnic group, with no more claims to the country than the Iraqis who arrived there last Thursday. As Friedman puts it, “it’s almost as if the state has sided with the immigrants against the Swedish working class.”

“Exit Folkhemssverige - En samhällsmodells sönderfall” (Exit the People’s Home of Sweden — The Downfall of a Model of Society) is a book from 2005 about immigration and the welfare state model called “the people’s home,” written by Jonathan Friedman, Ingrid Björkman, Jan Elfverson and Åke Wedin. According to them, the Multicultural elites see themselves first of all as citizens of the world. In order to emphasize and accentuate “diversity,” everything associated with the native culture is deliberately disparaged. Opposition to this is considered racism: “The dominant ideology in Sweden, which has been made dominant by powerful methods of silencing and repression, is a totalitarian ideology, where the elites oppose the national aspect of the nation state. The problem is that the ethnic group that are described as Swedes implicitly are considered to be nationalists, and thereby are viewed as racists.”

Jens Orback, Minister for Democracy, Metropolitan Affairs, Integration and Gender Equality from the Social Democratic Party said during a debate in Swedish radio in 2004 that “We must be open and tolerant towards Islam and Muslims because when we become a minority, they will be so towards us.”

This was a government which knew perfectly well that their people risked becoming a minority in their own country, yet did nothing to stop this. On the contrary: Pierre Schori, Minister for Immigration, during a parliamentary debate in 1997 said that: “Racism and xenophobia should be banned and chased [away],” and that one should not accept “excuses, such as that there were flaws in the immigration and refugee policies.”

In other words: It should be viewed as a crime for the native white population not to assist in wiping

themselves out from the lands where their ancestors have lived since prehistoric times. The state is turned into a committed enemy of the very people it was supposed to serve and protect. Swedes pay some of the highest tax rates in the world, and for this they get runaway crime rates and a government that is actively hostile to their interests.

Mona Sahlin has held various posts in Social Democratic cabinets, among others as Minister for Democracy, Integration and Gender Equality. Sahlin has said that many Swedes are envious of immigrants because they, unlike the Swedes, have a culture, a history, something which ties them together. Notice how Swedish authorities first formally state that Swedes don't have a history or culture, and then proceed to lament the fact that Swedes don't have a history or culture. A neat trick: First you break down the traditional values of your nation; then you proclaim that it needs to import values from abroad because it doesn't have any.

Sahlin has stated that "If two equally qualified persons apply for a job at a workplace with few immigrants, the one called Muhammad should get the job....It should be considered an asset to have an ethnic background different from the Swedish one." This is another way of saying that the natives according to Multicultural doctrines are second-rate citizens of their own country. In 2004 she was quoted as saying that "A concerted effort that aims at educating Swedes that immigrants are a blessing to their country must be pursued," stressing that her compatriots must accept that society is Multicultural. "Like it or not, this is the new Sweden." Mona Sahlin was elected leader of the Social Democratic Party in 2007.

Only a week after members of Antifascistisk Action (AFA) harassed a Swedish judge and vandalized his house, AFA members demonstrated alongside the Swedish police, the Swedish government and the Swedish media establishment during Pride Week, Stockholm's annual gay celebration, in August 2007. At the very end of the Pride Parade marched a group of black-clothed and masked blackhood or blackshirt representatives of AFA, ready to beat up anybody deemed to be insufficiently tolerant (they did hospitalize at least one person that day, according to their website). Adjacent to them marched a number of policemen, including members of the Swedish Gay Police organization.

According to journalist Kurt Lundgren, Mona Sahlin, expected to become Prime Minister in the future, was a participant in the Pride Festival in 2007 where she was graduated, after several questions about orgasms, to the F\*\*king Medal Award. Has she given some thought to what effect this will have in a country with exploding rape statistics ? According to the leading blogger Dick Erixon, the number of reported rapes in Sweden is now three times as high as in New York City. NYC has roughly the same number of inhabitants but it is a metropolis, whereas Sweden is a country with mostly rural areas and villages. Swedish girls are called "whores" on a regular basis and are increasingly scared to go outside, yet the nation's arguably most powerful woman takes the F\*\*king Medal Award. How will this be perceived?

Moreover, how will these views on "sexual liberation" be reconciled with her party's cozy relationship with groups affiliated with the Muslim Brotherhood, since several of its international leaders have indicated that gays should be killed? Top Brotherhood cleric Yusuf al-Qaradawi discussed at the Arabic satellite channel al-Jazeera various punishments he said were appropriate for homosexuality, including being thrown from heights or burnings: "Some say we should burn them, and so on. There is disagreement." Mona Sahlin thinks that the right-wing opposition party the Sweden Democrats are "a misogynistic" party. I suppose the Muslim Brotherhood isn't? What about her party's immigration policies, gang rapes of native girls and honor killings of immigrant girls? The Swedish Church has announced that it will allow gay couples to marry in church. Will the Social Democrats make sure that gay couples will be allowed to marry in mosques controlled by the MB? More interestingly, will the left-wing extremists of AFA attack them for homophobia if they refuse?

Kurt Lundgren in May 2007 had a noteworthy story on his blog. Lundgren reported about a magazine aimed at preschool teachers who take care of children between the ages of 0-6 years old. It included recommendations to promote "gender equality" and "sexual equality." He said that in a kindergarten in Stockholm, parents were encouraged by the preschool teachers to equip their sons with dresses and female first names. There are now weeks in some places when boys HAVE TO wear a dress. Lundgren considers this sexual indoctrination to be worse than political propaganda:

"To give sex education to preschool children, to force them to have an opinion on gay sex and queer (lesbians, transsexuals, bisexuality, fetishism, cross over, sex change etc.) I regard as abuse of children....Little children,

we are talking about three to six-year-olds here, cannot in the preschool protect themselves from these sexual assaults. Their parents are not there, the children are totally left to themselves.”

One comment left by a blog reader stated: “My 13-year-old son had ‘equality day’ [in school] and had to listen to a transvestite. I have myself never encountered or talked to one during my considerably longer life. Why is this important? Today’s children know nothing about the crimes of Communism, but everything about the sexual orientation of transvestites.”

This is quite literally true. A poll carried out on behalf of the Organization for Information on Communism found that 90 percent of Swedes between the ages of 15 and 20 had never heard of the Gulag, although 95 percent knew of Auschwitz. “Unfortunately we were not at all surprised by the findings,” Ander Hjemdahl, the founder of UOK, told website The Local. In the nationwide poll, 43 percent believed that Communist regimes had claimed less than one million lives. The actual figure is estimated at around 100 million. 40 percent believed that Communism had contributed to increased prosperity in the world. Mr. Hjemdahl states several reasons for this massive ignorance, among them that “a large majority of Swedish journalists are left-wingers, many of them quite far left.”

In Norway, a specialist in early childhood education stirred debate by supporting “sexual games” for children of pre-school age. Family therapist Jesper Juul conceded that “many are disturbed by children’s sexuality, but I think it’s important to put it on the agenda.” Most Norwegians send their children to kindergartens before they begin school at age six, and many average citizens were shocked by this. “I thought at first that this was a joke,” said Karin Ståhl Woldseth, a spokesman for the right-wing Progress Party. “Children don’t need more exposure to this in kindergartens. We think it will damage their health.” Child psychologist Thore Langfeldt in an interview publicly admitted that sex games were encouraged by those who fear that people could become infected by the ideas of conservative groups and therefore want to make children immune from Christian morality as early as possible.

I do not believe sex in itself is sinful or bad. However, being civilized means precisely that you learn to control your urges and natural impulses, sexual, violent or otherwise. Moreover, sex in this situation isn’t “natural;” it is specifically used for destructive ideological purposes. This sexualization of childhood is increasingly prevalent all over the Western world.

The Frankfurt school of cultural Marxism, with such thinkers as Antonio Gramsci and Georg Lukacs, aimed at overthrowing capitalist rule by undermining the hegemonic culture. According to Gramsci, the Socialist revolution, which failed to spread following the Russian Revolution in 1917, could never take place until people were liberated from Western culture, and particularly from their “Christian soul.” As Lukacs said in 1919, “Who will save us from Western Civilization?” This could be done through breaking down traditional Christian morality and family patterns and undermining the established culture from within by a long march through the institutions. In 2008, we can see that this strategy has been successful in Western media and academia, which are not only lukewarm in defending our civilization but in many cases actively side with our enemies. The irony is that most Westerners have never heard of Gramsci, yet ideas similar to his have had a huge impact on their lives.

Mona Sahlin, leader of the Social Democratic Party, confirmed in early October 2008 that her party and the Greens want to form a coalition government in 2010. What kind of policy will such a government follow? Miljöpartiet de Gröna, the Swedish Green Party, state on their official website that the education system should start working for “gender equality” at an early age; children need counterweights to the gender roles which girls and boys are raised into. Therefore teachers and personnel in child care services must finish an education in equality before they are given their exams. They also want to abolish grades in schools.

The Green Party favor ideological Globalism in its purest form. They want a “world citizenship” to replace the national citizenship, totally free migration on a global basis, global taxes and a strengthened United Nations to ensure a just world order. Their political program is so radical that I almost wish I had time to translate it all into English, just to document it:

“We do not believe in artificial borders. We have a vision of unrestricted immigration and emigration, where people have the right to live and work wherever they please....We want Sweden to become an international role model by producing a plan to implement unrestricted immigration.”

They have a strong focus on anti-discrimination and racism, and desire harsh and swift penalties for “discrimination” yet soft penalties for many other crimes. They want “religiously neutral” holidays (no Christmas or Easter) and education against racism and discrimination to be taught in schools. No “bigotry” against any group of people (except whites presumably, and white men in particular) will be allowed, and all forms of bigotry should be banned by law regardless of where it is voiced. Among the forms of racism they specify should be aggressively stamped out is “Islamophobia.” However, they understand that racism cannot be totally stamped out until we have dismantled the “racist world order” and replaced it with a just world order where none suffer and the poor are no longer exploited.

The Swedish Green Party state explicitly that the concepts male and female are “socially constructed” and forced upon all human beings. In order to reach the new world order, it is paramount that all such artificial identities are broken down. This should be facilitated by the education system and specially trained teachers. They believe that “all human beings” should be free to choose whatever name they desire. By this they appear to mean “gender” as well. They want everything to be “gender neutral,” not only marriage ceremonies but identity cards.

I assume this means that I should be able to choose a female name on my identity card and that the state is oppressing me if it doesn’t allow this. Since employing artificial categories such as “male” and “female” contributes to upholding the exploitative world order of poverty and global warming, one must assume that children will starve in the Sudan if I cannot call myself “Mary” or “Christine” on my driver’s license. After all, I may have a penis, but it’s a socially constructed penis and it contributes to an unjust capitalist system.

Just for the record: In 2007, protests from female soldiers led to the Swedish military removing the penis of a heraldic lion depicted on the Nordic Battlegroup’s coat of arms. The armed forces agreed to emasculate the lion after a group of women from the rapid reaction force lodged a complaint to the European Court of Justice. This is obviously funny, but the serious side to this is how women are trying to castrate their own men, in this case literally, at the same time as their country has one of the highest rape frequencies of any Western country. This is caused by Multiculturalism and runaway immigration, both policies which are disproportionately supported by female voters. So the feminization of society supported by the feminists makes women less safe, not more. The same can be said of all Western nations.

And no, not all differences between men and women are “socially constructed.” Professor Helmuth Nyborg at Aarhus University in Denmark did research which revealed that there are differences between the sexes when it comes to intelligence. This triggered massive resistance. According to him, “Within the realms of psychology you are not allowed to talk about intelligence. You cannot measure intelligence and you cannot rank people according to intelligence. The entire field of intelligence is a so-called ‘no-go-area.’” If you still choose to proceed, you are a bad person. If you look at differences between groups of people, you are viewed as immoral and plain evil.

According to Professor Annica Dahlstrom, an expert in neuroscience, men are found at the extremes of high and low intelligence. Although female geniuses do exist, they are much less frequent than male ones. She believes children should be left primarily in the care of their mother during their first years of living. The feminist establishment in Sweden claims that she has misused her position as a scientist to reinforce gender stereotypes. As Dahlström says, “The difference between boys and girls, in terms of their biology and brain, is greater than we could ever have imagined.” Differences between the sexes emerge in fetuses and are clearly recognizable at the age of three. The centers of the brain dealing with verbal communication, the interpretation of facial expressions and body language are more developed in girls even at this early age. Forcing boys to behave like girls are vice versa is unnatural and will inevitably hurt them. Such a policy could even be viewed as “mental abuse” of children in her view. Yet this is exactly what is happening, and sometimes with government support.

The British historian Roland Huntford wrote a book in the early 1970s about Sweden called The New Totalitarians. He noted how equality between the sexes was aggressively promoted from the late 1960s and early 70s. This was closely linked to a campaign for sexual liberation:

“Indeed, the word ‘freedom’ in Swedish has come to mean almost exclusively sexual freedom, product perhaps of an unadmitted realization that it is absent, or unwanted, elsewhere. Through sex instruction at school for



the young, and incessant propaganda in the mass media for the older generations, most of Sweden has been taught to believe that freedom has been achieved through sex. Because he is sexually emancipated, the Swede believes that he is a free man, and judges liberty entirely in sexual terms....The Swedish government has taken what it is pleased to call 'the sexual revolution' under its wing. Children are impressed at school that sexual emancipation is their birthright, and this is done in such a way as to suggest that the State is offering them their liberty from old-fashioned restrictions."

By old-fashioned restrictions, read Christian morality. Huntford noted that this came together with efforts to downplay or attack Western culture prior to the French Revolution. As Mr. Olof Palme, who was Swedish Socialist Prime Minister from the late 1960s until 1986, said: "The Renaissance So-called? Western culture? What does it mean to us?"

The teaching of history was severely curtailed in Swedish schools because it was "impractical." Religion, and Christianity in particular, was presented as superstition designed to fool the masses, who had been liberated from this ancient oppression by the labor movement. As he noted, "Scrapping historical knowledge deprives pupils of the instrument for criticizing society here and now. And perhaps that is the intended effect."

"The State," in the words of Ingvar Carlsson, then Minister of Education, "is concerned with morality from a desire to change society." Mr. Carlsson, who was Swedish Prime Minister as late as 1996, also stated that "School is the spearhead of Socialism" and that it "teaches people to respect the consensus, and not to sabotage it."

"We have no ethical standards in education, and no rules for sexual behaviour," in the words of Dr Gösta Rodhe, the then head of the department of sexual education in the Directorate of Schools, and thus in some ways the executive officer of government sexual policy. "You see, since there's a lack of tension in Swedish politics, younger people have got to find release and excitement in sexual tension instead."

Mr. Huntford ended his book with a warning that this system of soft-totalitarianism could be exported to other countries. This was in the early 1970s, and he has been proven right since:

"The Swedes have demonstrated how present techniques can be applied in ideal conditions. Sweden is a control experiment on an isolated and sterilized subject. Pioneers in the new totalitarianism, the Swedes are a warning of what probably lies in store for the rest of us, unless we take care to resist control and centralization, and unless we remember that politics are not to be delegated, but are the concern of the individual. The new totalitarians, dealing in persuasion and manipulation, must be more efficient than the old, who depended upon force."

For my own part, I find it interesting that the same people who in the 60s and 70s broke up the traditional family structure in Western countries and warned people against the dangers of overpopulation, telling people to lower their birth rates, came back a few years later and said that we had to import millions of immigrants because we have such low birth rates.

"As political and economic freedom diminishes" said Aldous Huxley in Brave New World, "sexual freedom tends compensatingly to increase." This fits perfectly with Huntford's description. The state strips away your personal, economic and political freedom, yet grants you sexual freedom in return, boldly hailing itself as your liberator. Sweden in 2008 is a society with no real freedom of speech if you deviate from the ruling ideology. The more crushing ideological censorship and political repression become, the more frantic the displays of "sexual freedom" get. Sex is freedom; freedom means sex, and only sex.

State authorities present this as liberation of women and sexual liberation, but it is actually about breaking down rival sources of power: The traditional Christian culture and the nuclear family. This leaves the state more powerful since it can regulate all aspects of life and, most importantly, can indoctrinate the nation's children as it sees fit, without undue parental interference. The state replaces your family, raises your children and cares for your elderly.

The social engineers have discovered that despite decades of state-sponsored gender equality propaganda, boys and girls still behave differently. Instead of concluding that maybe there are innate differences between the sexes, they have decided to indoctrinate children more thoroughly, starting at an even earlier age, to



eradicate “gender differences.”

The Swedish Consumers Association reacted angrily to a star-shaped, pink ice-cream because it represented gender-profiling. “Girly, GB’s new ice pop, is pink and has make-up inside the stick. It says a lot about what GB thinks about girls and how they should be,” the association said in a statement. Sweden does not need more products that reinforce existing prejudices about sex roles, so they asked the producer to make the product less gender specific. A bus driver in the increasingly Muslim-dominated town of Malmö was fired from his job following revelations that he stopped a woman from boarding his bus because she was wearing full Islamic face-covering, which made her hard to identify. In Sweden, it is unacceptable if girls are presented with pink ice-creams because this reinforces “gender stereotypes,” but the burka is just fine.

Meanwhile, the country is in the midst of the most explosive rape wave in recent history, largely caused by immigration. While Swedish girls are called “whores” by immigrants, Swedish boys are told to be as “gender neutral” as possible. Traditionally, a nation has been defended by masculine men who take pride in their heritage. By removing cultural pride and any sense of masculinity among native men, the country is rendered effectively defenseless. And maybe that was the intention?

In Western Europe, great emphasis is placed on destroying the heritage of the native population and instilling whites with a guilt complex and shame designed to alienate them from their own history. They are supposed to abase themselves in front of immigrants and tell them how worthless and evil their culture is, or alternatively how much they lament the fact that they don’t have a culture.

While Christianity has been ridiculed for generations, so much so that Christians complain about persecution, Islam is presented in textbooks as a benevolent religion and granted a high degree of respect in the public sphere. Maybe I have a conspiratorial mindset, but the way Multiculturalists condemn Christianity and praise Islam is so consistent that I cannot help but ask whether some of them have deliberately set out to uproot the plague of Christianity from our culture once and for all. They ridicule it at any given opportunity and at the same time import a rival religion and groom it as a replacement. When the day comes when people have gotten sufficiently tired of nihilism, Christianity will have become so discredited as to have been eliminated as a viable alternative, and people will be left with Islam. Or maybe it’s simply about eradicating anything and everything associated with European culture.

Sweden has been known as a “model country” with an economic system as a third way between capitalism and Socialism, or enlightened Socialism as it has been called. In 2008, the “Swedish model” no longer refers to an economic success story (and the Swedish economy grew rapidly before the welfare state was established), but to a horror story of cultural suicide, Gramscian cultural Marxism, ideological censorship and repression of dissent. Sweden is not unique. Similar trends are evident all over the Western world. But Political Correctness is unusual in its severity here, in part because Sweden already viewed itself as an “ideological state,” and the country is definitely ahead of the curve in ideological repression. Those of us who still have some love for aspects of what once was traditional Swedish culture can only hope that some of it is still alive and can re-emerge once the current ideological paradigm has disintegrated. The question remains, though, how much will be left of the Swedish nation once we get to that point. What is certain is that rough times are ahead, not just for Sweden but for the entire Western world, as Multiculturalism facilitates the slow disintegration of our societies.

## Islamization and Cowardice in Scandinavia

*This essay was first published at The Brussels Journal in September 2008, but has been substantially expanded with later additions from a number of essays.*

I will start with saying a few words about the situation in Finland. The word “Finlandization” was coined to describe the concessions made under the pressure of circumstances by a small country when confronted by a much more powerful neighbor, which in Finland’s case was the Soviet Union. Until the Revolution in 1917, Finland was a part of the Russian Empire. Prior to the Napoleonic wars it had been a part of the Kingdom for Sweden for centuries and still has a Swedish-speaking minority. The presence on its eastern border of Russia’s Soviet successor kept Finnish independence balanced on a knife’s edge up until the collapse of Communism. Nowadays it seems that the entire West is voluntarily agreeing to be Finlandized with respect to Islam.

Finns in the far north of Europe, unlike their cousins in the southern regions of the continent, have had little direct exposure to and historical experience with Islam. Finland still has significantly fewer immigrants than Scandinavian neighbors Norway and Denmark, not to mention Sweden, which is why I will not make the country my main focus here. In the 70’s Finland was significantly poorer than Sweden, and this only changed during the 80’s and 90’s. Finland has received some immigration from the 1990s onwards, including a number of Muslims. Although demographically speaking less affected yet, Finland is by no means immune to Political Correctness and Multicultural censorship. KGS from the quality Finnish blog Tundra Tabloids has posted an English translation of an essay that was originally written in Finnish by fellow blogger Vasarahammer:

“In today’s Finland multiculturalism and political correctness rule the day the same way as in other Western European countries. But because of the short history of mass immigration, the societal development together with other effects of immigration lag behind. Finland is roughly 20 years behind in the development of ‘multicultural’ society. However, if the current academic, media and political elite have their way, the situation may change very rapidly.... After 9/11 Khodr Chehab, the leader of a Finnish Muslim community, appeared together in Senate square with the Finnish Lutheran Archbishop Jukka Paarma. The significance of the moment was lost by many, but it first showed, how the Finnish establishment was eager to appease Islam the same way Finnish establishment appeased the Soviet Union. But it was the cartoon crisis that finally exposed the attitude of the Finnish political elite. Not only did Prime Minister Vanhanen apologize for the publication of the cartoons but the police started an investigation concerning the publication of Muhammad cartoons by Suomen Sisu. The publication was followed by fierce calls of exercise of ‘responsible freedom of speech’ as well as outright calls to the authorities to prosecute the publications in all manners provided by the law.”

The organization Suomen Sisu was never prosecuted because they republished the Muhammad cartoons on their website, but the Finnish PM apologized in public for the act. Today, the best known critic of Islam and mass immigration in Finland comes from the academic circles. His name is Jussi Halla-aho, a doctor of Slavic studies.

Among Nordic and indeed Western countries, Denmark stands out with its popular opposition to Islamization. It is not a coincidence that the Muhammad cartoons were published there. This should not be taken as an indication that Denmark is a paradise. Danes face the same problems of Islamic aggression, Politically Correct cultural elites and political dhimmitude, but they have a genuine, intellectual resistance movement as well. Danes are deeply civilized people, but they are not cowards. They have an instinct for opposing evil ideologies and managed to save most of their Jews from the Nazis during the Second World War.

In 2008, three years after the cartoons were first published, the matter is still very much alive in the minds of many Muslims. More than 200 lawmakers shouted “Death to the enemies of Islam” during an angry demonstration outside the Afghan parliament, protesting the reprinting of the cartoons in Denmark and the release of the Islam-critical film *Fitna* by the Dutch politician Wilders. At the same time, Danish aid is helping schools to re-open in Afghanistan, even though critics say the curriculum is based on fundamentalist Islam. A

campaign to boycott Danish and Dutch products was launched in Jordan. The campaign will include ads in newspapers and on radio and television that urge consumers to avoid buying named goods. The organisation, “The Messenger of Allah Unites Us,” have produced t-shirts, bumper stickers and posters with the campaign logo “Live without it.”

“[Danish] Muslim organizations intend to take the case to the European Court of Human Rights,” Muslim leader Mohammed Khalid Samha told IslamOnline, the large English language website founded by the influential Yusuf al-Qaradawi, after a Danish court rejected a suit by seven Muslim groups. “We were quite sure that the Danish judiciary would not be fair to Muslims,” said Samha. Meanwhile, two Tunisian men were arrested and charged with plotting the murder of cartoonist Kurt Westergaard.

In September 2008 a group of Jihadist Muslims discussed how to poison Denmark’s water supply in retaliation for the cartoons. Writer Hugh Fitzgerald stated in a comment:

“I assume that were such an attack to be made, the Danish people would demand that as a matter of national security, the Muslims living in Denmark would be expelled. At this point, after all that has been said and done, if you continue to self- identify as a Muslim, it is perfectly reasonable for Infidels to assume that you know what Islam teaches, or rather inculcates, and that you agree with it, or at least are not about to do anything to prevent or denounce such teachings.....Any more attempts on the lives of Infidels has to be treated as an act of war, by Muslims on non-Muslims. In World War II the Allied bombers did not selectively bomb only full-fledged enthusiasts for the Nazis, but bombed German cities — and Japanese ones, too — into rubble, to defeat the enemy. It is the collective that counts in wartime, and we do not have to spend our time delicately distinguishing between this or that degree of support, by Muslims, for Jihad, violent or otherwise.”

As Bruce Bawer put it in the essay Courage and Cowardice in Scandinavia from June 2008, following a bomb in Pakistan targeting Denmark:

“When a car bomb exploded outside Denmark’s embassy in Islamabad on June 2, killing eight, it was easy to guess who had done it and why. Sure enough, some days later al-Qaeda took credit and confirmed its motive: the now-infamous Muhammed cartoons. Originally published in the *Jyllands-Posten* daily on September 30, 2005, they were reprinted by a raft of Danish dailies last February 13 in a show of solidarity with turban-bomb cartoonist Kurt Westergaard, the target of three would-be assassins who had been arrested the day before. Presumably this rather surprising action — the Danish media, generally speaking, have given *Jyllands-Posten* a rough time for the past three years for upsetting the Muslims — was the immediate cause for the bombing.”

“Blasphemy” against Islam carries the death penalty according to sharia law, and this is far from redundant. For instance, in June 2008 a Pakistani judge sentenced a Muslim man to death on charges that he insulted Islam’s Prophet Muhammad.

In contrast to Denmark’s defiance, other Scandinavian countries surrendered to Islamic pressure as fast as humanly possible. Bawer again:

“Sweden took another route. When a political website featured a *Jyllands-Posten* cartoon, the government sent police to close it down. More recently, hit with his own cartoon crisis involving artist Lars Vilks, Prime Minister Fredrik Reinfeldt not only met Muslim ambassadors, but was praised by one for his ‘spirit of appeasement.’ Norway didn’t cover itself in glory, either. On the pretext that a tiny newspaper, *Magazinet*, had reprinted the *Jyllands-Posten* cartoons (never mind that major dailies in Spain, Germany, and France had done so as well), the cartoon jihadists chose to target Norway as well, plainly betting that the dialogue-happy, UN-worshipping ‘peace country’ would curb its freedoms at the first hint of Muslim displeasure. They were right. Norway’s government caved in ignominiously, holding a press conference on February 10, 2006, at which *Magazinet*’s cowed editor, Vejbjørn Selbekk, with the blessing of Prime Minister Jens Stoltenberg, grovelled before a posse of imams and apologised to them for exercising his freedom of speech. It was

probably the most disgraceful day in modern Norwegian history, but you wouldn't know it by the politicians and journalists, who celebrated this selling out of freedom as a triumph of peacemaking."

Selbekk, editor of the small Christian newspaper *Magazinet*, had firmly resisted pressure from Muslims who had made death threats and from the Norwegian establishment. But eventually Norway's Minister of Labor and Social Inclusion Bjarne Håkon Hanssen hastily called a press conference at a major government office building in Oslo. There Selbekk issued an abject apology for reprinting the cartoons. At his side, accepting his act of contrition and asking that all threats now be withdrawn, was Mohammed Hamdan, the then head of Norway's Islamic Council. As Bawer indicates, it was a picture right out of a sharia courtroom, with the Muslim leader declaring Selbekk to be henceforth under his protection.

In a Friday sermon on February 3 2006, Yusuf al-Qaradawi, the spiritual leader of the Muslim Brotherhood, the world's largest Islamic organization, exhorted worshippers to show rage in response to the cartoons. The sermon was aired on Arab TV. The day after, the Danish and Norwegian embassies in Syria were set ablaze by an angry mob. It should be mentioned that Norway and Denmark are members of NATO and that destroying an embassy could be considered an act of war. A few days later, a delegation led by Mohammed Hamdan of Norway's Islamic Council and a senior pastor representing Oslo's bishop visited Qatar to meet Mr. Qaradawi. The trip received support from the Norwegian government. Foreign Minister Jonas Gahr Støre was happy to accept the aid of the Islamic Council and its leader Hamdan. Al-Qaradawi then accepted the apology that Vejbjørn Selbekk had issued on February 10.

Walid al-Kubaisi, a Muslim dissident living in Norway, warned that Yusuf al-Qaradawi is more dangerous than the terrorist leader Osama bin Laden, and that the Muslim Brotherhood, whose founder Hassan al-Banna Qaradawi followed in Egypt when he was young, wants the world to submit to sharia. Kubaisi reacted strongly to the statement by Mr. Hamdan that he would now give Mr. Selbekk protection: "It frightens me that he presents himself as an authority that can grant or revoke protection. Does this mean that [Minister] Bjarne Håkon Hanssen thinks that the next time I feel threatened because of something I have written, I should contact the Islamic Council, not the police? Sadly, the government, in their eagerness to end the current troubles, have made the authoritarian forces stronger." Kubaisi feared that Islamic hardliners would from now on burn something every time they feel offended about something and expect to get their will.

Trond Giske, Minister of Culture and Church Affairs from the Labor Party, met with Mohammed Hamdan of the Islamic Council a few months after the embassy attacks and announced that government subsidies for the Islamic Council would be raised from 60,000 kroner a year to half a million. That's more than a 700% increase in a single year. The government declared it would meet more frequently with the Islamic Council to "improve dialogue." Its leader Hamdan smiled after having talked with Mr. Giske for about one hour. "We're pretty pleased with the meeting. For us it's important to improve contacts with the government so that we can get to know each other better."

In the fall of 2008, the Norwegian Islamic Council was still waiting for a reply from the European Council for Fatwa and Research, which is led by Yusuf al-Qaradawi and other clerics affiliated with the Muslim Brotherhood, before it decided whether or not it is in favor of the death penalty for homosexuality. Qaradawi discussed at the Arabic satellite channel al-Jazeera various punishments he said were appropriate for homosexuality, including being thrown from great heights or burnings. At the same time, Mr. Qaradawi supports marriage to girls at the age of nine, as did his Prophet.

The status given to non-Muslims who accept being second-rate citizens, dhimmis, under Islamic rule is technically referred to as "protected." During the Cartoon Jihad, the left-wing coalition government demonstrated in public that Norwegian authorities did not control the security of their citizens and had to accept Muslim intervention to secure their safety. This amounted to the acceptance of Islamic rule according to sharia law, a view which was subsequently strengthened by payments to Muslims at home and abroad. Undoubtedly these payments offered by Mr. Giske on behalf of the Government were viewed by Muslims as *jizya*, the "protection money" non-Muslims are required to pay in willing submission (Koran, 9:29) as a

sign of their inferior status vis-à-vis Islam, as a compensation for not being slain.

Mohammed Hamdan of the Islamic Council participated in a meeting with members of the terrorist organization Hamas at Stortinget, the Norwegian parliament, in the summer of 2006. According to him, he was only an interpreter, but his brother Osama Hamdan was a member of parliament for Hamas in the Palestinian Territories. Members of Hamas have made it perfectly clear that their Jihad against Israel is part of a wider war against the West. For instance, Hamas member of parliament and cleric Yunis Al-Astal said on TV in April 2008 that “Very soon, Allah willing, Rome will be conquered, just like Constantinople was, as was prophesized by our Prophet Muhammad.... the Islamic conquests, which will spread through Europe in its entirety, and then will turn to the two Americas, and even Eastern Europe.” Calls to conquer the West are frequently made by leaders of the Muslim Brotherhood, including Qaradawi, but they are rarely reported in mainstream Western media.

Norway in 2007 became first Western country to recognize the then Hamas-led Palestinian government and to make the first transfer of direct financial aid to it. Foreign Minister Jonas Gahr Støre of the Labor Party urged others to follow. Hamas is the Palestinian branch of the Muslim Brotherhood. They state this explicitly in their charter, which means that the left-wing government of PM Jens Stoltenberg was willing to fund an organization whose spiritual leader had recently caused physical attacks against their country and is waging a war against their civilization. This was applauded by most media commentators. This policy is presented as “tolerance” whereas in older times it would probably have been seen as treason.

FM Støre participated in a conference with participants from dozens of countries and media outlets on how to “report diversity” in a non-offensive manner, with Arab News from Saudi Arabia as a moderator. The Cartoon Jihad had prompted Indonesia and Norway to join forces and promote a Global Inter-Media Dialogue. In June 2007 this was held in Oslo.

Keynote speaker at the conference, Doudou Diène, the United Nations Special Envoy for racism, xenophobia and intolerance, urged the media to actively participate in the creation of a Multicultural society, and expressed concerns that the democratic process could lead to immigration-restrictive parties gaining influence in the West. Mr. Diène represents Senegal, a predominantly Muslim country which is a member of the Organization of the Islamic Conference (OIC), the largest voting bloc at the United Nations.

There were already signs that large portions of the mainstream media had been working according to similar ideas long before this conference. In Britain, leading figures of the BBC have proudly announced that they actively promote Multiculturalism. In Denmark in 2008, while their country was threatened by Muslims across the world, public broadcaster Danmarks Radio, the local equivalent of the BBC and with the same left-wing pro-Multicultural bias, held a “Miss Headscarf” beauty contest for women with the requirement being that they were over 15 and wore a veil, the way Muslim women are supposed to do.

As American scholar Dr. Daniel Pipes notes, “Self-hating Westerners have an out-sized importance due to their prominent role as shapers of opinion in universities, the media, religious institutions, and the arts. They serve as the Islamists’ auxiliary mujahideen.”

Following new threats in Denmark, the regional Norwegian daily *Adresseavisen* in 2008 decided to show solidarity with the Danish cartoonists. As Bruce Bawer writes:

“Trondheim’s *Adresseavisen* daily ran a cartoon which, though not depicting Muhammed, angered ‘moderate’ Muslim lawyer Abid Q. Raja, who — apparently feeling that *Adresseavisen* had obeyed the word but not the spirit of the *Magazinet* accords — argued that the cartoon shouldn’t have been published because it would be ‘misunderstood’ by Muslims. Pakistani ambassador Rab Nawaz Khan agreed, calling the cartoon an ‘act of terror’ that can ‘endanger the lives of Norwegian citizens.’ When a cartoon is terrorism and a bomb is a form of expression, you’re in Orwell country. Yet the star of the moment was Norwegian novelist Dag Solstad, who only days before the bombing delivered what you might call Norway’s version of Rowan Williams’s sharia



lecture. Solstad didn't go in for sharia explicitly — instead, he made the argument that free speech is actually undesirable, since it drowns meritorious works (such as his novels, presumably) in a sea of vulgarity (a category to which he relegated the Muhammed cartoons). Solstad's colleagues offered polite demurrals."

Mr. Solstad, with a history of long and strong sympathies for various Communist movements, is not unique. By the time these words are written, many Norwegian observers and intellectuals have criticized "free speech fundamentalists" in the major media.

In 2007, Minister of Justice Knut Storberget from the Labor Party said that the Norwegian Constitution Day, May 17th, is for "everybody," and that it's appropriate to demonstrate this by displaying a multitude of flags and cultures. It is now permitted to celebrate it by waving the flag of the United Nations. The editor of a Multicultural newspaper has suggested that the Norwegian national anthem should be translated to Urdu because this would be good for integration. Norwegians are supposed to celebrate their independence by singing their national anthem in Urdu, by wearing the national costume of Ghana and by waving the flag of the UN. This would be the equivalent of Americans celebrating the Fourth of July by waving the UN flag and by singing the Star-Spangled Banner in Arabic.

Norwegian police have discovered that a number of taxi drivers, many of whom have already been charged with tax evasion in one of the worst cases of welfare fraud in the nation's history, have close contact with Pakistani gangs and operate as couriers of arms and drugs. In Oslo it is documented that criminal gangs have ties to Jihadist groups at home and abroad.

Minister Bjarne Håkon Hanssen from the Labor Party has called for increased immigration from Pakistan because this would be good for the economy. A majority of Muslims voted for the Labor Party in the 2005 elections, which the left-wing coalition won by a very slim margin. Eighty-three percent of Muslims voted for Leftist parties, just as all over Western Europe. Kristin Halvorsen, the leader of the Socialist Left Party, began her election campaign in the Pakistani countryside, praising all the "blood, sweat and tears Pakistanis in Norway have spent on building the country." She is now Minister of Finance. The deputy leader of the Socialist Left Party, Audun Lysbakken, stated in November 2005 — while the party's leader was Minister of Finance — that he wants to close the stock exchange and abolish private property rights because this would lead to more democracy. His party is highly critical of the United States and has been pushing, unsuccessfully so far, for a general boycott of Israel.

I should mention that the Socialist Left Party, just like virtually all left-wing parties supportive of Multiculturalism and high taxation in the West, is supported by a disproportionate number of female voters, while the "racist" Progress Party that wants to limit mass immigration is supported significantly more by men than by women. Feminists hail this as an indication that women are more "open-minded and compassionate" than men. Perhaps. But it could also be an indication that women are more naïve than men, since they support the continued importation of cultures that enslave women. Isn't that self-defeating? If women are indeed more politically naïve than men, does that mean that the increased feminization and female influence in politics we've had for decades now has made the West soft?

The agency that handles immigration to Norway, UDI, in 2005 thought that the country must make it more attractive for both skilled and unskilled workers to move to Norway. "We need more immigrants," claimed UDI chief Trygve Nordby, who has previously worked in key positions for the Socialist Left Party in parliament. "Too few dare to say that we have a large need for non-professional workers as well," he said. UDI, in turn, should be able to have more flexibility in deciding cases, and process cases more quickly and efficiently. As it turned out later, the bureaucrats of UDI were in fact so "flexible" that they had been running their own, private immigration policies, and that the agency's liberal interpretation of asylum rules had "stretched the boundaries" of the law. UDI violated both the law and political directives when it granted residency permits to nearly 200 Iraqi Kurds in the fall of 2005. A commission that probed the controversial permits blasted Nordby, and his successor resigned.

The idea that mass immigration from developing countries is “good for the economy” is 100% incorrect. Those who want a detailed analysis of this can read my online essays *When Danes Pay Danegeld*, *What Does Muslim Immigration Cost Europe?* and *The Welfare State is Dead, Long Live the Welfare State*, among others. Skilled immigrants want to move to a country with low tax rates so that they benefit the most from their work, while those who want to exploit the welfare state system move to countries with high taxation. Muslims add huge indirect costs due to the threat of Jihadist terrorism. This goes for all Western nations.

An ever growing group of non-Western immigrants in Norway is dependent on welfare. This was the conclusion of a study by Tyra Ekhaugen of the Frisch Centre for Economic Research and the University of Oslo. Ekhaugen’s research contradicted the often heard assertion that the labor market depends increasingly on immigrants. The study indicated quite the reverse. If the present evolution continues, immigration will increase the pressure on the welfare state rather than relieve it because many immigrants do not join the tax-paying part of the population. “Non-Western immigrants” in Norway are recipients of social security benefits ten times as frequently as native Norwegians.

Journalist Halvor Tjønn in June 2006 cited a report from NHO, the Confederation of Norwegian Enterprise. NHO stated that the current immigration policies were a serious threat to the country’s economy. The most profitable immigration would be high-skilled workers who stay for period of limited duration, but at the same time not too brief. A Danish think tank has estimated that the net cost of immigration was up to 50 billion kroner every year, and those were cautious estimates. Denmark could thus save huge sums by stopping immigration from less developed countries. A study found that every other immigrant from the Third World — especially from Muslim countries — lacked the qualifications for even the most menial jobs on the organized labor market.

According to Statistics Norway, immigrants generally have a three times higher unemployment rate than native Norwegians. It should be noted that non-Muslim Asians are much more successful, which means that the unemployment rate among Muslims is even higher than 300 % that of the natives. The number of Muslims in Norway has quadrupled over the past 15 years. The number of immigrants in Oslo increased by 40 percent in just five years, from 2002 to 2007. With current trends remaining unchanged, native Norwegians will be a minority in their own country within a few decades.

Admittedly, part of the problem lies with the Western European welfare state system itself and cannot be blamed on the immigrants alone. Iranian Nima Sanandaji tells of his family’s meeting with the Swedish system: “In Sweden my family encountered a political system that seemed very strange. The interpreter told us that Sweden is a country where the government will put a check into your mailbox each month if you don’t work. She explained that there was no reason to get a job....Although my mother got several jobs, we concluded that this really didn’t improve our family’s economy. During the sixteen years we have been in Sweden, my mother has in total worked less than one year.”

However, part of the problem is due to the mentality of some of those who move here, yet display no loyalty to their new countries. Immigrant men who divorce their wives according to secular law but stay married to them according to Islamic law represent an increasing problem in the city of Odense, Denmark, according to deputy mayor Erik Simonsen. The result is a large number of “single” women who receive welfare support.

In other countries, some Muslim men do this trick with several women at the same time. Some observers blamed the Muslim riots in France in 2005, accurately described by writer Mark Steyn as the “first welfare funded Jihad in history,” on polygamy practiced by Muslim men, paid for by French taxpayers. But also immigrants who are financially independent are cheating, says Simonsen. “80 percent of the immigrant economy in Odense is a black market economy. That’s a lot, and it cannot be tolerated, because the law is equal for all.”

As one Muslim in Norway stated: “I worked in a Pakistani shop, but all of the work there is ‘unofficial.’ Neither the boss nor I pay taxes to Norwegian authorities. In addition to this, I receive 100% disability benefits and

welfare. I have to be cunning to make as much money as possible, since this is my only objective with being in Norway.” In Britain, one member of an Islamic group warned an undercover reporter against getting a job because it would be contributing to the kuffar (non-Muslim) system.

Andrew Bostom quotes the observations made by Dr. Muqtedar Khan, a much-ballyhooed Muslim moderate, after a trip to Belgium. Even Khan admitted the largesse of Belgium’s welfare state towards its Muslims: “...the welfare check was normally 70 percent to 80 percent of the salary. For those [Muslims] who were married with children, welfare provided comfortable living and with low property values, even those on welfare could actually own homes.”

Undoubtedly, many Muslims view welfare money from the infidels as *jizya*, the poll-tax non-Muslims according to the Koran are supposed to pay to Muslims as tribute and a sign of their inferior status and submission to Islamic rule. As Bostom points out, “such attitudes, whatever their origins, raise this larger basic question: why does the West continue to validate the raw, imbalanced bigotry that denies non-Muslims any access to Mecca and Medina—upon pain of imprisonment, torture, and death—while Muslims demand and are granted the ability to settle, with generous accommodations, within Europe or America?”

Mullah Krekar is convicted of terrorism in Jordan. He has lived off welfare money in Oslo for years and reputedly gets free taxi rides from Muslim cab drivers who think he’s a great guy. Norway’s most controversial refugee has lodged a threat against the country that has hosted him and his family for the past decade and a half. Krekar continues to fight deportation back to Iraq and calls any such order “an offense” that should be punished. “I defend my rights in their court just like Western people defend their rights. I am patient like they are patient. But if my patience runs out, I will react like Orientals do.” Krekar has spoken positively about terrorist leader Osama bin Laden and the recently killed Iraqi al-Qaida leader Abu Musab al-Zarqawi. He has indicated that Muslims will succeed in conquering the West because they breed like mosquitoes.

Head of the Norwegian Police Security Service (PST) Jørn Holme stated in 2007 that he fears that a terrorist attack carried about by Muslims would lead to lynching of local Muslims because Norwegians are “a bit stupid, not good at integrating” and “don’t understand” the supposedly huge differences between Islam and Islamism. In other words, the “Islamophobes” are as much of a danger as the Jihadists. I recommend that he reads The Al Qaeda Reader by the historian Raymond Ibrahim to see that Islamic terrorists justify their actions from a straightforward reading of Islamic texts.

In Britain, the police have investigated allegations that the four suspected London bombers from July 2005 collected more than £500,000 in benefits payments. The suspects are supposed to have used multiple aliases and addresses. One, Mr Ibrahim, is said to have had six aliases. Some are shown to have claimed several nationalities, ages and national insurance numbers while in Britain. Investigators believe that bogus names were used to make some benefit claims. Two are also alleged to have obtained asylum using bogus passports and false names and nationalities. Mr Ibrahim, alleged to be the Hackney bus bomber, is believed to have used two dates of birth, six aliases, two national insurance numbers and two addresses. Mr Osman apparently went under five names, variously claimed that he was Eritrean or Somali, and used four addresses in southwest London. Mr Omar, 24, who is linked with the attack on a Tube train near Warren Street, had five aliases.

DP111, an articulate and highly intelligent British blog commentator, points out that as Muslim families are large, a single wage earner will find it hard to support all. They will need to supplement this by getting considerable benefits from the state:

“A considerable amount of this money to Muslims from the British taxpayer finds its way to finance the Jihad. The same scenario must hold in all European states that have a considerable Muslim population. We are in the ridiculous position of sheltering and feeding a population that is hell bent on destroying us. Islam’s people, from the very outset, were nothing but a collective to gain plunder and loot at the expense of other people’s work. In the past, it was conducted by war, conquest and then pillage. Now it is conducted by immigration (invasion), begging or crime. Meanwhile Muslim nations are given huge loans (aid), which we and they know

will never be repaid. Thus, from a purely economic point of view, Islam seems to be a collective of people who live by the ethos of ‘beg, borrow or steal.’ So why do we, the capitalist countries, who do not believe in offering anyone a free lunch, subsidise the most lazy yet aggressive bunch of people on God’s planet, who are bent on subverting our democratic system? The nub is, how has it come about, that the natural progression of the most advanced civilisation on earth is towards stupidity?”

He points out that the cost of Muslim immigration is much higher than just welfare. “One really needs to factor the loss of confidence in the markets, loss of new investment because of a fear of flying or the disenchantment with intrusive security. Then there is the increased cost of insurance on all businesses.” All this affects the competitiveness of business with nations that do not have a major Islamic presence, such as Japan and Korea. We may be talking of million dollars per Muslim individual per year. And to top it all, we give them aid, welfare benefits on a grand scale, while we live in fear, and our freedoms compromised.

One of the reasons for the low participation in the work force among Muslims is a very high drop out rate from schools, especially for boys. Although Muslims themselves blame this on “poor integration efforts” and “marginalization,” some of them are actively obstructing their kids’ education, lest they become too much like the infidels. Thousands of Muslim children with Scandinavian citizenship are sent to Koran schools in Pakistan and other countries, to prevent them from becoming “too Westernized.” When this practice was documented and criticized by the Norwegian organization [Human Rights Service](#), Pakistanis in Norway had the gall to ask for a school for their children [in Pakistan](#), funded by Norwegian taxpayers. According to the Copenhagen Post, in Denmark when the country’s schools open their doors again after the summer holidays, not every student is there to enter. Some schools report one in [every five students missing from the schoolrooms](#).

Not that the problems always disappear when they actually attend school, either. Going to school is no child’s game for many children in Copenhagen, where [beatings, kicks](#), robberies, and threats have become everyday occurrences. The perpetrators are normally their own age.

In 2005, it was reported that [82 percent](#) of crimes in Copenhagen were committed by immigrants or descendants of immigrants, and the police pressed charges against second-generation immigrants [five times as](#) frequently per capita as against ethnic Danes. Doormen working in the Danish capital are now often armed with guns or clubs so as to be able to defend themselves against [violent immigrant gangs](#). There is more violence than ever before and some immigrant gangs have been known to seek out doormen in their private homes.

A [shoot-out between two Pakistani gangs](#) one crowded Sunday evening at Oslo’s popular waterfront complex Aker Brygge left two men wounded. Newspaper VG reported that a policeman had to run for his life from an angry crowd of Pakistanis. The plainclothes policeman was hit in the face and [told to leave](#) the Furuset shopping center. He was told that it was none of his business being in this area, and that a gang of young men had defined Furuset as their turf and didn’t accept “intruders.” The authorities have already ceded control over chunks of their own capital city. Peaceful rallies denouncing Islamic terrorism or supporting Israel have been physically attacked. Similar things are happening with increasing frequency in cities across Western Europe, from Birmingham to Hamburg.

There has been a sharp increase in violent crime in urban areas. In [2001](#), newspapers *Aftenposten* and *Dagbladet* reported that two out of three charged with rape in Oslo were immigrants. Ethnic Norwegian women were victims in 80 percent of the cases. Both newspapers then conveniently “forgot” about this again until 2007, although the number of rape charges continued to rise to historic levels. They were thus at best guilty of extreme incompetence, since their former articles were still available online. I wrote a number of blog posts about the issue in Norwegian and English. It has later been revealed that a police report was made about the rape problem in 2005, a year with parliamentary elections, yet the Oslo-based *Aftenposten* newspaper did not [mention](#) this report at the time. There [reported number of rapes in Oslo](#) is now allegedly six times as high per capita as in New York.



This trend is the same all over Western Europe. The number of rapes committed by some immigrant groups is so high that it is difficult to view it only as random acts of individuals. It resembles warfare. German journalist Gudrun Eussner considers this to be “sexuality as a weapon against disobedient Muslim as well as non-Muslim women, both categorized as ‘unbelievers’. Against them jihad is the duty, and what to do with women ‘conquered’ in jihad, this may be read in the Qur’an: they become slaves to be used by the victors.”

French filmmaker Pierre Rehov states that: “A friend of mine is a retired chief of police, who used to be in charge of the security of a major city in the south of France. He reported to me that his men had to face an average of 10 rapes a week, 80% made by Muslim young men. 30% being what we call, in French, a ‘tournante,’ meaning that the victim is being raped by an entire gang, one after the other, often during an entire night. He was astonished that, in most cases, the parents not only would back up their rapist children, but also would not even understand why they would be arrested. There is an instant shift in the notion of good and evil as a major component of culture. The only evil those parents would see, genuinely, is the temptation that the male children had to face. Since in most cases the victims were not Muslims, the parents’ answer and rejection was even more genuine: how could their boys be guilty of anything, when normally answering to a provocation by occidental women, known for their unacceptable behavior?”

Sheik Taj Din al-Hilaly, who called himself the Grand Mufti of Australia and New Zealand, in a sermon compared unveiled women to uncovered meat: “If you take uncovered meat and put it on the street, on the pavement, in a garden, in a park, or in the backyard, without a cover and the cats eat it, then whose fault will it be, the cats, or the uncovered meat’s? The uncovered meat is the disaster. If the meat was covered the cats wouldn’t roam around it.” Abduljalil Sajid of the Muslim Council of Britain defended Hilaly as “a great scholar.”

Shahid Mehdi, an Islamic mufti in Copenhagen, Denmark, stated in 2005 in a televised interview that women who do not wear headscarves are “asking for rape,” so Hilaly is not an isolated case. According to Tanveer Ahmed, a Sydney-based psychiatrist, the attitude “comes from households, where young Muslims get the message that white girls are different, and that women in general are a corrupting influence.” There have been several brutal gang rapes of white women by Muslim immigrant men in Australia.

There is a growing wave of crime and violence targeting native Europeans. The response of the authorities to this has been to increase crackdowns on “racism” — by the white natives. In 2005 the Norwegian parliament — with the support of 85% of MPs — passed a new Discrimination Act, prepared by then Minister of Integration from the Conservative Party, Erna Solberg, who had earlier called for the establishment of a sharia council in Norway.

A spokesman for the right-wing Progress Party, Per Sandberg, feared that the law would jeopardize the rights of law-abiding citizens. Reverse burden of proof is combined with liability to pay compensation, which means that innocent persons risk having to pay huge sums for things they didn’t do. If an immigrant claims that a native has somehow discriminated against him or made a discriminatory remark, the native person has to mount proof of his own innocence. This harsh law was passed despite the fact that at the time most immigrants themselves claimed that they had encountered little discrimination.

I have later discovered that similar laws have been passed across much of Western Europe, encouraged by the EU and the Council of Europe in cooperation with international Islamic organizations. The Norwegian law followed an initiative from the CoE. There was virtually no public debate about this law, which was passed in relative silence prior to the national elections that year. Not a single journalist genuinely criticized it, and most barely mentioned it at all before it was passed. The same journalists otherwise tend to be very concerned about the legal or “human rights” of Islamic terrorists, but apparently not of their own people.

The Equality and Anti-discrimination Ombud Beate Gangås, a white lesbian feminist, before the municipal elections in 2007 warned all political parties against making “discriminatory” remarks regarding immigration policies, but called for actively reducing the number of white, heterosexual men in politics. There was little real



debate about immigration in the heavily left-leaning media that year, but an all the more passionate witch-hunt looking for racists, and by that I mean whites only.

Following the case of alleged “racism” which is described below, the left-wing coalition government represented by Minister Bjarne Håkon Hanssen met with 13 immigrant organizations and announced that racists, apparently meaning white natives only, should be “smoked out” of all public sector jobs. Minister Heidi Grande Røys from the Socialist Left Party stated that the government would practice “zero tolerance” for racism. Asked whether people who are critical of mass immigration should be allowed to hold public sector jobs, she replied that no, if this could be deemed to interfere with their ability to do their job, this would not be allowed. Since we have already seen that mass immigration costs huge amounts of money, this means that the natives are forced to fund their own colonization and eventual eradication. Opposition to this is banned as “racism.”

The same government in October 2008 funded a conference in Oslo involving “dialogue” with a number of sharia-sponsoring groups from the Middle East, including the Egyptian branch of the Muslim Brotherhood. The Egyptian branch of the Brotherhood has in addition to its founder Hassan al-Banna produced Sayyid Qutb, the ideological godfather of terrorists such as Osama bin Laden, as well as the current MB spiritual leader Yusuf al-Qaradawi. The section Fred og Forsoning (“Peace and Reconciliation”) of the Foreign Ministry financed the research project “Fault Lines of Islamism” ( pdf ) led by Bjørn Olav Utvik from the University of Oslo. Gry Larsen from the Labor Party was scheduled to meet with representatives of these groups. The government can meet with radical Islamic groups, but want to silence those among the natives who don’t want Muslims with such views to settle in their country. No “dialogue” is possible with them.

Two ambulance drivers in Oslo, both of them native Norwegians, were in August 2007 involved in what became a massively hyped case supposedly involving “white racism.” They had arrived to pick up an injured African man. As ambulance driver Erik Schjenken months later explained, the man “pulled down his pants and urinated on my colleague’s leg. My colleague was surprised, pulled away and called him a pig. That’s when we viewed the man as a problem, and decided it was best if the police took him to the clinic.” Ali Farah, the Somali man in question, had more severe head injuries than the drivers assumed at the time. “We made a mistake, because we interpreted his urination as willful and a provocation, but NOT because we had racist or discriminatory motives,” Schjenken later wrote.

Based on weak suspicions of “racism,” the mass media, leading intellectuals and politicians launched what can only be described as a witch-hunt against the two ambulance drivers. “This would never happen to a white man,” said the prominent Norwegian-Pakistani lawyer Abid Q. Raja, representing Farah and his family. Author Anne Holt, who once served as Minister of Justice for the Labor Party, wrote an essay in newspaper *Aftenposten* which in my view amounted to a moral execution of the drivers. Both of them were suspended from service and became the target of widespread, negative media coverage. They were later cleared after an investigation of the incident by the Norwegian Board of Health Supervision. However, the Equality and Anti-Discrimination Ombud, or the Multicultural Inquisition as I like to call it, ruled that Farah was a victim of discrimination and that the ambulance personnel broke the anti-discrimination laws. As noted before, the anti-discrimination law states that natives are guilty of “discrimination” almost as soon as they are suspected of it.

It should be mentioned here that this African man was injured in the first place because he was beaten by another African man, from Ghana. In Norway, a country straddling the Arctic Circle and with no colonial history, one African man beats another African man, and the result is that the white ambulance drivers, who have dedicated their lives to helping other people, become the targets of a lynch mob led by the country’s media. Driver Erik Schjenken needed professional help as he was brought to the brink of suicide.

According to Hans Rustad from the major blog Document.no, the ideology of anti-racism in sometimes resembles what we have seen from Communists regimes. Being called a “racist” under Multiculturalism is similar to being called a “class traitor” under Communism. The mere accusation is powerful enough to destroy

lives. Rustad fears that anti-racism in some cases leads to lawlessness. Ambulance driver Schjenken was a well-regarded employee whose work had helped save many lives, yet because of one error of judgment, which in my view was understandable given the situation, his life was ruined. All because he happened to have a politically incorrect skin color while the other person was non-white.

What makes this even more absurd is that in Norway, as throughout the Western world, white-on-non-white violence is exceedingly rare. The vast majority of racism and racist violence comes from non-whites against whites, or between different groups of non-whites. In Oslo, young girls are raped; schoolchildren are threatened with death, robbed and assaulted. The police have warned against “an alarming rise in street violence” in urban areas across the country. This is directly caused by mass immigration, which is nevertheless still championed by the very same media who attacked these two ambulance drivers.

For instance, a 17-year-old Somalian was convicted of the rape of a young girl in Oslo. The court stated that the rape was unusually brutal and lasted for several hours. The man choked the girl for so long that the medical doctor who examined her said that she could have died. The girl suffers from severe psychological problems in the aftermath of the attack. The African youth was sentenced to four and half years in prison. This sentence included another rape, where his Norwegian-Moroccan friend raped a 13-year-old girl whilst the Somalian helped to threaten her and keep guard. She has naturally been traumatized from the incident.

Numerous natives have had their lives ruined by similar attacks, yet anti-white racism is rarely mentioned as a problem by the mainstream media. Whites are apparently fair game. The more vicious the rapes, muggings, and stabbings targeting whites in their own country get, the more aggressive and hysterical the witch-hunt on “white racism” becomes.

French philosopher Alain Finkielkraut has warned that “the lofty idea of ‘the war on racism’ is gradually turning into a hideously false ideology. And this anti-racism will be for the 21st century what Communism was for the 20th century: A source of violence.”

Professor Sigurd Skirbekk of the University of Oslo notes that “In 1994, the German periodical Focus pointed to opinion polls taken in Germany, France and England in which 55, 52 and 50 per cent, respectively, felt that their countries accepted too many immigrants. From Norway we have a representative study from 1987 which showed that 51% of the people felt that the country should accept fewer immigrants; 25% felt that politicians should stick to current practice, while only 8% wanted to accept more immigrants. A similar study in Sweden, made a couple of years later, showed that 54% of Swedes felt that too many people were immigrating to Sweden. In later studies the figures have varied somewhat; but there have always been more people who have favored a restrictive policy than those who favored liberalization.” Thus, according to Skirbekk, “***the extent of recent immigration cannot be explained on the basis of popular opinion*** [my emphasis].”

Skirbekk wonders whether there is a quasi-religious undercurrent to the anti-racist movement, and that it is quite literally the equivalent of the witch-hunts of previous ages:

“A number of researchers have come to see that certain issues in the migration debate has religious connotations. The Norwegian social anthropologist Inger Lise Lien, for instance, has written that ‘racism’ in the public immigration debate has become a word used to label the demons among us, the impure from whom all decent people should remain aloof. We have every reason to believe that the use of the term ‘racist’ in our day has many functional similarities with the use of the word ‘heretic’ three hundred years ago....It is presumably fully possible to join anti-racist movements with the sole motive of identifying with something that appears to be politically correct, or in order to be a part of a collective that entitles one to demonstrate and to harass splinter groups that no one cares to defend.” But “behind the slogan ‘crush the racists,’ there might well be something more than a primitive desire to exercise violence. The battle also involves an element of being in a struggle for purity versus impurity. And since racism is something murky, anti-racism and the colorful community it purportedly represents, becomes an expression of what is pure.”

The Norwegian left-wing author [Torgrim Eggen](#) warns against “race wars” brought about by mass immigration yet continues to support it. Questioned about what we can do to avoid this scenario he states: “That’s a very stupid question to ask to an author. This presupposes that I want everybody to be happy, have a good time and don’t have any problems. If so, what do they want me to write about?”

I will give him credit for his honesty: This is the most frank admission I have seen of the fact that some people don’t WANT society to be harmonious; they think it’s boring. There is no worse fate for a self-professed intellectual than to live in a nation that is by and large prosperous, peaceful and well-functioning because nobody will care about his advice or follow his guidance, as is befitting a person of his intelligence.

Even if you manage to create a society that it prosperous, this isn’t always a stable situation. People will gradually forget the qualities that made them successful in the first place, and because they enjoy their material comforts they become too soft to defend themselves against threatening brutes, a condition we call “decadence.” Human beings also appear to have a deep-seated need for something to struggle with and for, and Western welfare states seem to lack this. Some people react to this by drug abuse, to make their lives more colorful and meaningful; others turn to Utopian ideas. Bad things can be said about Islamic terrorists, but at least they are not boring, which could explain why some Westerners are attracted to their cause.

During the Multicultural craze of the 1990s, Eggen in an essay entitled “[The psychotic racism](#)” warned against turbulence caused by mass immigration. The solution to this was not to limit immigration, but to limit criticism of immigration. According to him, xenophobia and opposition to mass immigration should be viewed as a mental illness, and hence “the solution to this xenophobia is that you should distribute medication to those who are seriously affected. I have discussed this with professor of community medicine, Dr. Per Fugelli, and he liked the idea.” Mr. Fugelli suggested putting anti psychotic drugs in the city’s drinking water.

This may sound too extreme to be meant seriously, but Fugelli has continued to chastise those who are critical of national immigration policies. Eggen warned that arguments about how ordinary people are concerned over mass immigration shouldn’t be accepted because this could lead to Fascism: “One should be on one’s guard against people, especially politicians, who invoke xenophobia on behalf of others. And if certain people start their reasoning with phrases such as ‘ordinary people feel that,’ one shouldn’t argue at all, one should hit [them].”

Thomas Hylland Eriksen, professor of social anthropology at the University of Oslo, heads a multi-million [project](#) sponsored by the state trying to envision how the new Multicultural society will work. He is a career Multiculturalist and intellectual celebrity in his country, a frequent contributor to the public debate and lives, according to himself, in a boring, white monocultural part of the city, insulated from the effects of cultural diversity. Hylland Eriksen has proclaimed the death of (Western) nation states as if he derives pleasure from it, and has stated that the Nidaros Cathedral (Nidarosdomen), the most prominent church in the country, should no longer serve as a national symbol in our Multicultural society.

Mr. Eriksen has clashed with Ole Jørgen Anfindsen, who runs the bilingual quality website [HonestThinking.org](#) and warns against the effects of uncontrolled mass immigration. [According to](#) Hylland Eriksen, “Cosmopolites insist on a world comprising of more colors than black and white. In such a world, the problems presented by Ole-Jørgen Anfindsen are not just petty, but irrelevant.”

What are the problems presented by Mr. Anfindsen? Well, he has published calculations indicating that if the current immigration continues, native Norwegians will be a minority in their own country within a couple of generations. Given the fact that ethnic groups who become minorities in their own lands usually have a hard time, and always get persecuted when the newcomers are Muslims, one would assume that this would be interesting information. But for self-proclaimed “Multicultural cosmopolites,” it is “petty and irrelevant” to even consider that this could represent a problem. Eriksen calls Anfindsen “stupid and ignorant,” and hints that “Maybe Anfindsen’s agenda is inspired by a kind of perverted Christianity (he has a Christian background).”

Yes, Anfindsen does have a Christian background. Is that supposed to disqualify a person from worrying about whether his grandchildren will be persecuted? Mr. Eriksen, like other Western Multiculturalists, worries about Islamophobia but is more than willing to mock Christianity. A newspaper essay co-authored by Eriksen states that: “Is he [Anfindsen] asking us to once again repeat the obvious in that the murder of Theo van Gogh, various acts of terrorism and death threats against newspaper editors have nothing to do with Islam?”

Nothing to do with Islam? Really?

Mohammed Bouyeri, born in Amsterdam of Moroccan parents, killed Theo van Gogh as he was cycling in Amsterdam on Nov. 2, 2004, shooting and stabbing before slashing his throat and pinning a note to his body with a knife. “I did what I did purely out my beliefs,” he told judges while clutching a Koran. “I want you to know that I acted out of conviction and not that I took his life because he was Dutch or because I was Moroccan,” but because he believed van Gogh insulted Islam in his film criticizing the treatment of Muslim women.

So a peaceful Christian man is accused of having a dark, secret agenda, while a Muslim murderer who brags about his Islamic motivations has nothing to do with Islam? A Serbian doctor from the former Yugoslavia, where a Multicultural society recently collapsed in a horrific civil war, warned against the effects of unchecked mass immigration to Western Europe. Thomas Hylland Eriksen responded by chastising her for her “lack of visions.”

Apparently, your worth as an intellectual is measured in how grandiose your ideas are. The greater your visions, the more dazzling your intellect is and thus the greater prestige should be awarded to you. Whether those visions actually correspond to reality and human nature is of secondary importance. In fact, many a self-proclaimed intellectual will be downright offended by the petty considerations of his more pedestrian fellow citizens, concerned with what effects his ideas will have in real life. The fact that some people could get hurt from his ideas doesn’t discourage him. Truly great advances for mankind can only be accomplished through sacrifices, preferably made by others.

I’ve heard Multiculturalists state specifically that our societies should be based on the principle of Multiculturalism and various ethnic groups only tied together by “human rights.” But that is a weak glue to hold a society together, to say the least. What’s more: Once you decide that your society should be founded upon human rights and nothing but human rights, you give away power to those defining human rights to decide the future of your society and your country, for instance in managing your immigration policies.

The French philosopher and cultural critic Alain Finkielkraut thinks that Europe has made human rights its new gospel. Has human rights fundamentalism approached the status of quasi-religion? Have we acquired a new class of scribes, who claim the exclusive right to interpret their Holy Texts in order to reveal Absolute Truth, and scream “blasphemy” at the few heretics who dare question their authority? The Universal Declaration of Human Rights is a great document, but it is written by humans and may contain human flaws. We shouldn’t treat as if it were a revelation from God, carved into stone. Far less should we deem as infallible the veritable maze of regulations and well-meaning human rights resolutions that have rendered our nations virtually unable to defend themselves.

Moreover, who decides which “human rights” should take precedence? If you say that free migration should be a universal human right, you trample on the right of the peoples at the receiving end of mass immigration to preserve their cultural heritage. More explicitly, should Muslim nations be allowed to dump their unsustainable population growth in the West? Since they tend not to respect human rights because they frequently conflict with sharia, allowing them to undermine countries that do respect individual rights means that human rights will become a tool for undermining democratic nations in favor of authoritarian ones, precisely the opposite of what was originally intended.

Following the release of a [UN population report](#) in 2007 which indicated a global population increase of several billion people over the coming decades, Marie Simonsen, the political editor of Norwegian left-wing newspaper *Dagbladet*, which has spent decades denouncing the right-wing Progress Party for their “racist” policies of limiting mass immigration, wrote that it should be considered a universal human right for people everywhere to migrate wherever they want to. This would mean certain annihilation for a tiny, wealthy and naïve Scandinavian nation. Ms. Simonsen thus endorsed the gradual eradication of her own people, no doubt congratulating herself for her tolerance. To my knowledge, not a single word of protest was voiced by any other journalist to this statement.

“Human rights” was a concept originally intended to ensure liberty. Now it’s used to eradicate an entire civilization, in the name of tolerance and diversity, and the natives are specifically banned from protesting against this.

Is there no opposition to this evilness and insanity? Fortunately, there is. Per Edgar Kokkvold, Secretary-General of the Norwegian Press Association, deserves credit for his principled opposition to censorship vis-à-vis the Muhammad cartoons (which earned him several death threats). A book by a former MP for the Conservative Party, Hallgrim Berg, warns against plans to turn Europe into Eurabia. He discusses anti-Americanism and maintains that the United States is the only power capable of securing freedom. In 2005 the police issued a mobile security alarm to the then leader of the Progress Party, Carl I. Hagen. He criticized Islam and could see no similarity with the concept of morality found in Christianity. He said that if Israel loses in the Middle East, Europe will succumb to Islam next. Therefore, Christians should support Israel and oppose Islamic inroads into Europe. In an unprecedented step, a group of Muslim ambassadors blasted Hagen in a public letter. Other politicians quickly caved in and condemned Mr. Hagen, including Prime Minister Kjell Magne Bondevik of the Christian Democrats. By 2008, the Progress Party stands a real chance of replacing the Labor Party as the largest party in the country, for the first time in generations.

As elsewhere in the Western world, the general public is not quite as suicidal as the political and cultural elites, and therein lies the best hope for the future. You can find pockets of resistance in Norway (and to a lesser extent Sweden), but the general picture is admittedly rather bleak. Denmark is currently the only Scandinavian country with something resembling a spine, but Danes compensate for this by being one of the leading countries in the Western world in opposing Islamization.



## On Anti-White Racism

*This essay is an amalgam of several posts of mine.*

The violence waged by Muslim gangs in Europe is usually labelled as “crime,” but I believe it should more accurately be called Jihad. Those who know Islamic history, described in books such as [The Truth About Muhammad](#) by Robert Spencer, know that looting and stealing the property of non-Muslims has been part and parcel of Jihad from the very beginning. In fact, so much of the behavior of Muhammad and the early Muslims could be deemed criminal that it is difficult to know exactly where crime ends and Jihad begins. In the city of Oslo, it is documented that some of the criminal Muslim gangs also have close ties to radical religious groups at home and abroad.

As Dutch Arabist Hans Jansen points out, the Koran is seen by some Muslims as a God-given “hunting licence,” granting them the right to assault and even murder non-Muslims. It is hardly accidental that while Muslims make up about ten percent of the population in France, they make up an estimated seventy percent or more of French prison inmates. Muslims are overrepresented in jails in countries all over the world, and a striking number of non-Muslims in jail convert to Islam.

In the city of Antwerp, Belgium, Marij Uijt den Bogaard from 2003 to 2006 worked as a civil servant in the immigrant borough of Berchem. She noted how radical Islamist groups began to take over the immigrant neighborhoods, but was fired when she warned against this danger in her reports to the authorities:

“Many victims of burglaries in houses and cars, of steaming and other forms of violence, can testify that aggression by Muslims is not directed against brothers and sisters, but against whoever is a kafir, a non-believer. Young Muslims justify their behaviour towards women who do not wear the headscarf, whether Muslim or non-Muslim, by referring to the Salafist teaching which says that these women are whores and should be treated as such. They told me this. I wrote it down in my reports, but the authorities refuse to hear it.”

Muslim violence targets non-Muslims regardless of skin color, in Asia, Africa, Europe and elsewhere. However, some of the violence directed against people of European origins is anti-white racism, not Jihad. In March 2005, peaceful white French demonstrators were attacked by bands of black and Arab youths. One 18-year-old named Heikel added that he had “a pleasant memory” of repeatedly kicking a student, already defenseless on the ground. The sentiment was a desire to “take revenge on whites.”

Why is there so little public discussion of anti-white racism? I have heard two explanations for this. The first one is that white people are more racist than non-whites, a claim I find highly dubious these days. The other is that we should focus mainly on white racism because “white people are so powerful.” But whites are, demographically speaking, a rapidly shrinking global minority. We are even a shrinking percentage of the population in the West.

Barbara Kay of Canada’s *National Post* writes about a new fad called Whiteness Studies:

“The goal of WS is to entrench permanent race consciousness in everyone — eternal victimhood for nonwhites, eternal guilt for whites — and was most famously framed by WS chief guru, Noel Ignatiev, former professor at Harvard University, now teaching at the Massachusetts College of Art: “The key to solving the social problems of our age is to abolish the white race.”

Whiteness Studies began in the 1990s after the collapse of Communism, when some Marxists concluded that the key to Utopia was to undermine Western culture and white people, race war instead of class war, or perhaps race war as class war. Some of its inventors state their goals quite openly:

“Abolitionism is also a strategy: its aim is not racial harmony but class war. By attacking whiteness, the abolitionists seek to undermine the main pillar of capitalist rule in this country.” And: “The task is to gather together a minority determined to make it impossible for anyone to be white.”

Conservative social critic David Horowitz comments that: “Black studies celebrates blackness, Chicano studies

celebrates Chicanos, women's studies celebrates women, and white studies attacks white people as evil." However, despite widespread criticism, at least 30 institutions — from Princeton University to the University of California at Los Angeles — teach courses in Whiteness Studies.

-----  
A mandatory University of Delaware program in the United States required students to acknowledge that "all whites are racist," offering them "treatment" for incorrect attitudes regarding class, gender, religion or culture. A civil rights group cited excerpts from the university's Office of Residence Life Diversity Education Training documents, including the statement: "A racist is one who is both privileged and socialized on the basis of race by a white supremacist (racist) system. The term applies to all white people (i.e., people of European descent) living in the United States, regardless of class, gender, religion, culture or sexuality. By this definition, people of color cannot be racists, because as peoples within the U.S. system, they do not have the power to back up their prejudices, hostilities, or acts of discrimination." The education program also notes that "reverse racism" is "a term created and used by white people to deny their white privilege."

I've been trying to understand exactly what this "white privilege" consists of. In many Western European countries, if you are a native and in the mildest terms possible object to uncontrolled mass immigration which, if continued, will render the natives a minority in their own country, you will immediately be branded a racist and vilified. Most likely, your career will be over. The natives are de facto disenfranchised and are supposed to meekly fund their own colonization. If this is "privilege", then privilege is vastly overrated these days.

College professor Mike S. Adams writes about conspiracy theories he's heard among students attempting to blame various social ills on white people: "The Mona Lisa was painted by an African artist and stolen from a museum in Ethiopia. Most of the great works of art are African in origin and stolen by white people. This is done to promote the myth of white cultural superiority." Another one: "It is a proven fact that U.S. Coast Guard ships — on orders from President Bush — were seen crashing into the New Orleans levees during Hurricane Katrina. Bush did it to kill black people living in government housing projects."

Adams presents this as funny, but I don't think it is.

Dr. Kamau Kambon, former North Carolina State visiting professor of African Studies, told a forum at Howard University that: "We have to exterminate white people off the face of the planet to solve this problem....I'm saying to you that we need to solve this problem because they are going to kill us....The problem on the planet is white people."

Kambon may be an extreme example, but he is the product of a climate where accusing whites of the most insane things has become socially acceptable. Since the 1960s, the Western education system has become increasingly dedicated to demonizing traditional Western culture. Young people of European origins know little of their history, and what they do know they are often taught to hate. As a result, entire generations of young Westerners would find it difficult to articulate anything that's good about their culture and makes it worth preserving.

Robert Spencer has written about the demonization of Christianity in Western media and academia. He is right about this, but I sometimes suspect that this is part of a larger trend aimed at discrediting Western culture in general, of which Christianity has traditionally been a part. Those of us who are not Christians should reject this trend. First of all because it is factually incorrect: Christianity has made many positive contributions to our civilization and does not deserve the negative reputation it has gained in recent years; and second because the demonization of Christianity is part of a wider movement aimed at discrediting our heritage.

Here is a quote from Spencer's book Religion of Peace?:

"Attacks on Christian history and doctrine are an integral part of a larger effort to instill a sense of cultural shame in even non-Christian European and American youth — a shame that militates against their thinking the West is even worth defending. A white American student, 'Rachel,' unwittingly summed up this attitude when she told American Indian professor Dr. David Yeagley in 2001: 'Look, Dr. Yeagley, I don't see anything about my culture to be proud of. It's all nothing. My race is just nothing... Look at your culture. Look at American Indian tradition. Now I think that's really great. You have something to be proud of. My culture is nothing.' Yeagley mused: 'The Cheyenne people have a saying: A nation is never conquered until the hearts of

its women are on the ground...When Rachel denounced her people, she did it with the serene self-confidence of a High Priestess reciting a liturgy. She said it without fear of criticism or censure. And she received none....Who had conquered Rachel's people? What had led her to disrespect them? Why did she behave like a woman of a defeated tribe?"

As Allen G. King, an employment defense attorney put it: "I just have to leave you to your own devices, and because you are a white male," you will discriminate. In other words: You don't have to do anything; you're a racist simply because you're white and breathe.

All people of European origins can be considered racists. In Defending the West, former Muslim Ibn Warraq criticizes Edward Said's highly influential book *Orientalism* from 1978:

"In cultures already immune to self-criticism, Said helped Muslims, and particularly Arabs, perfect their already well-developed sense of self-pity. There is a kind of comfort and absolution in being told that none of your problems are of your making, that you do not have to accept any responsibility for the ills besetting your society. It is all the fault of the West, of infidels....*Orientalism* came at the precise time when anti-Western rhetoric was at its most shrill and was already being taught at Western universities, and when third-worldism was at its most popular. Jean-Paul Sartre preached that all white men were complicit in the exploitation of the third world, and that violence against Westerners was a legitimate means for colonized men to re-acquire their manhood. Said went further: 'It is therefore correct that every European, in what he could say about the Orient, was consequently a racist, an imperialist, and almost totally ethnocentric.' Not only, for Said, is every European a racist, but he must *necessarily* be so. As I have argued, Western civilization has been more willing to criticize itself than any other major culture."

René Descartes, French philosopher and one of the key thinkers of the Scientific Revolution — a Dead White Male as Western students now learn — is famous for his statement *Cogito ergo sum*: I think, therefore I am. Apparently, if Mr. Descartes has been alive today, he'd have to rephrase that to "I'm guilty, therefore I am."

I once heard the Dutch-Somali critic of Islam Ayaan Hirsi Ali be told that if she had been white, she would have been called a "racist." Which essentially means that if you're white, you're not allowed under any circumstances to stand up for your culture, far less criticize non-whites. It doesn't matter whether what you're saying is factually correct. Whites have effectively been disfranchised in matters related to the preservation of their own countries.

Jews were once told to "get back to Palestine." When they did, they were told to "get out of Palestine." The people who said this didn't object to where Jews lived, they objected to the fact that they existed at all. Similarly, I have noticed that while I have heard calls for people of European descent in the Americas, Australasia or southern Africa to "go back to Europe," the natives in Europe are demonized if they resist being turned into a minority in their own countries. The problem then, apparently, isn't where whites live; it's that we exist at all.

As Professor Ida Magli writes in an Italian essay entitled *A Nation for Sale*: "Why can't we protest? Why aren't we allowed what every people has always had the right to say, that is that no ruler, whatever the system of government — monarchy, dictatorship, democracy — has either the power or the right to sell off the homeland of their own subjects?"

It has happened many times that a people move into an area and subdue those living there before, but the natives have at least been allowed to defend themselves. It is unprecedented in the annals of history that a people is banned by their own leaders from defending their lands from foreign colonization. The established historical pattern is that people who are conquered by others are harassed by the newcomers. When we are being told that mass immigration is "inevitable," we are actually being told that verbal and physical abuse of our children is inevitable and that we should "get used to it." I see no reason to accept this. If mass immigration leads to harassment of my children then it is my duty to resist it.

Observer Ole Kulterstad notes that Europeans who are against free migration are labeled as "right-wing extremists." But common sense indicates that giving away your country to alien cultures is more extreme than merely wanting to preserve it as it once was.

I am personally tired of hearing how Islamic organizations like the Muslim Brotherhood that want to destroy my civilization are called “moderates,” whereas Westerners are “extremists” if we resist this, yet that is exactly what our media and authorities do. We are not extremists; we are subjected to policies that are extreme. Is reducing a people to a minority in their own land, without proper debate about future consequences, not to be regarded as extreme?

Some observers fear a “white extremist backlash,” but if people are so concerned about this then they should stop creating the foundations for such extremism to grow. Native Europeans increasingly get the feeling that they are being pushed into a corner and have an entirely justifiable fear of being overwhelmed. Fear leads to desperation, which sometimes leads to aggression. If we do get an outbreak of extremist political movements, this will not come about because Europeans are born evil; it will come about because they will be pushed into extremism, feel that their continued existence is at stake and that they have been abandoned by their authorities. The solution to this is to recognize that Western nations have accepted more immigration from alien cultures in a shorter period of time than any other civilization has done peacefully in history. We have reached our limit and we need a break before our entire political and economic system breaks down. The ongoing mass immigration is population dumping where less successful cultures dump their population in more successful ones. This is a form of global Communism and will generate the same disastrous effects by destroying successful communities and centers of excellence.

My ancestors have lived in this country since prehistoric times, yet we have no status as a distinct group. Pakistanis, Somalis and Kurds have the right to preserve their culture in my country, but I don't. The only ones who are specifically denied displaying any pride in their cultural heritage are people of European origins. That's the whole point of Multiculturalism. Our countries no longer exist as cultural entities, only as empty vessels to be filled with the “human rights” of other peoples.

Native Europeans are being told that we don't have a culture and that we thus “gain” culture when others move to our countries. This is an insult to thousands of years of European history, to the Celtic, Germanic and Slavic legacies and the Greco-Roman and Judeo-Christian heritage we all share in. The next moment we are told that we do have a culture, but it consists of nothing but a long line of crimes and is not worth preserving, anyway.

My nation doesn't have a colonial history. It gained its independence as late as the twentieth century, at which point it was a poor country, yet because I am white, I am held personally responsible for every bad act, perceived or real, committed by every person who happens to have roughly similar skin color throughout recorded history. American novelist Susan Sontag once stated that “The white race is the cancer of human history.” I am told that I am evil specifically because of my race, and five minutes later I'm told that “race” doesn't exist, it's socially constructed. What this means is that people of European origins can be verbally (and sometimes physically) attacked for being white, yet are systematically deprived of any means of defending themselves against these attacks or identifying the cause of them.

I do not hold Abdullah the kebab salesman personally responsible for sacking Constantinople, abducting millions of Europeans to slavery, colonizing the Iberian Peninsula, ruining the Balkans or threatening Vienna several times. I criticize Islam because Muslims have never admitted their past and will continue to commit atrocities as long as the institution of Jihad is alive. I do not believe in collective responsibility, and I do not think a person should be held responsible for actions done by his ancestors centuries ago. On the other hand, if I am to take the blame, personally, for every bad act, perceived or real, committed by any white person in the past, it is only fair that I, personally, should also take credit for their achievements.

It was to an overwhelming degree people of European stock who created the modern world. If I am to be held personally responsible for colonialism or the transatlantic slave trade, I want personal credit for the greatest advances for mankind made by any civilization that has ever existed on this planet. The next time our children are taught to feel bad for something that happened centuries ago, we should inform them that they should take pride in discovering electromagnetism and thus the telegraph, the telephone, radio, TV and the Internet, making chemistry into a scientific discipline (as opposed to alchemy), coining the concept of “gravity” and inventing rockets that could be used to explore space (Asian rockets used gunpowder and weighed a few kilograms at most), making the first accurate measurements of the speed of light, creating barometers and thermometers, thus establishing meteorology and the only mathematical temperature scales ever made by humans, inventing everything from light bulbs, refrigerators, beer cans and chocolate bars to cars, airplanes

and all modern means of transportation, inventing microscopes and founding microbiology and antiseptics in medicine. We did all of these things, and much more. Nobody else did, despite how much they claim otherwise.

If current immigration continues, France will soon become an African Muslim country that just happens to be north of the Mediterranean. If non-Europeans have the right to resist colonization, shouldn't Europeans have the same right? No Eastern European country has a colonial history and many Western European countries have only marginal ones. The Germans had a colony in Namibia. Why should they accept millions of Turks, who have a thousand years of extremely brutal colonial history of their own, because of this? There are not many Dutch people left in Indonesia, so why should the Dutch be rendered a minority in their major cities by Moroccans and others? And why should Portugal, Spain and Greece, which have suffered from centuries of Islamic colonization, have to accept Muslims into their lands? Switzerland, Sweden, Finland and Norway hardly have any colonial history at all, yet are still subject to mass immigration. The truth is that immigration policies bear little correlation to past history, population density or size. Ireland, Denmark, Britain, France, Sweden, Italy, Germany and the Netherlands have one, and only one, thing in common: The natives are white, and therefore seemingly have no legitimate claim to their own countries.

People of European origins have a right to exist, too. The primary duty you have as a human being is to preserve the heritage of your ancestors and pass on to your children a country they can call their own, where they can prosper and walk the streets in a major city without being harassed for who they are. We have the right to preserve our heritage and are under no obligation to commit collective suicide or serve as a dumping ground for other countries. It has nothing to do with animosity towards others. For my part, I still love visiting other cultures, but I will love this even more if I know I can also return to my own.



## Creating a European Indigenous People's Movement

*Published at The Brussels Journal in April 2008*

An American friend of mine has proposed that native Europeans should create a European Indigenous People's Movement. I have hesitated with supporting this because it sounded a bit too extreme. However, in more and more European cities, the native population is being pushed out of their own neighborhoods by immigrant gangs. The natives receive little or no aid from their authorities, sometimes blatant hostility, when faced with immigrant violence. In an age where the global population increases with billions of people in a few decades, it is entirely plausible, indeed likely, that the West could soon become demographically overwhelmed. Not few of our intellectuals seem to derive pleasure from this thought.

Bat Ye'or in her book about Eurabia has documented how the European Union is actively allowing Muslims to colonize European countries. The next time EU leaders complain about China's treatment of minorities, I suggest the Chinese answer the following: "Yes, we represent an anti-democratic organization dedicated to subduing the indigenous people of Tibet, but you represent an anti-democratic organization dedicated to displacing the indigenous peoples of an entire continent." There is no love lost between me and the Chinese Communist Party, an organization responsible for the deaths of tens of millions of its citizens, but even Chinese authorities do not actively seek to displace their own people with violent Muslims. European authorities do, at least in Western Europe.

In decadent societies of the past, the authorities didn't open the gates to hostile nations and ban opposition to this as intolerance and barbarophobia. What we are dealing with in the modern West is not merely decadence; it's one of the greatest betrayals in history. Our so-called leaders pass laws banning the opposition to our dispossession as "racism and hate speech." To native Europeans, when listening to our media and our leaders, it's as if we don't even exist, as if it were normal for them to put the interests of other nations over their own. Despite having "democratic" governments, many Western countries have authorities that are more hostile to their own people than dictators in some developing countries. Why?

At the Daily Telegraph, Simon Heffer suggests that the mass immigration encouraged in particular by the Labour governments of Blair and Brown in Britain is not happening out of incompetence, but is part of "a doctrinally driven determination by the new Government in 1997 to destroy our national identity and to advance multiculturalism." I agree, but this policy of state-sponsored population replacement is far from limited to Britain.

Numbers discussed in 2008 showed clearly that mass immigration has had no positive effects on the economy in Britain, and I have seen similar calculations from France, Denmark and Norway, among others. On the contrary, it is a drain on the finances of the native population, and that's even if we don't count the wave of terrorism, insecurity and street violence which is sweeping Western Europe, from Sweden via Germany to the Netherlands. On top of this, the costs of destruction of national cohesion and weakened cultural legacies are incalculable, yet mass immigration continues as if nothing has happened. In April 2008, a report indicated that Spain needed over two million new foreign workers just until 2020, many of whom are likely to come from Muslim North Africa. The authors of the report would call upon the Spanish government to adopt a new law on immigration "to facilitate the legal entry, take advantage of the new arrivals and encourage integration."

I have earlier toyed with the idea of giving native Norwegians the legal status as indigenous people in Norway. A large proportion of my ancestors have lived here since the end of the last Ice Age, for as long as this country has been habitable for humans. The original settlers, who came from Central Europe (Germany and the Czech Republic), have been supplemented by other Europeans. Genetic traces from peoples of Near Eastern origins who spread agriculture to Europe are detectable, but until recently most Europeans were overwhelmingly the descendants of men and women who had lived in the region for thousands, if not tens of thousands of years.

Genetically speaking, native Europeans have thus lived longer on the same continent than have Native Americans. Many Southeast Asians are descendants of southern Chinese settlers who displaced or eradicated the original, dark-skinned inhabitants of the region in early historical times, just as many of the nations of sub-Saharan Africa are Bantu invaders who displaced or eradicated the indigenous Khoi-San peoples throughout much of Africa. Modern-day Japanese have lived in Japan for a shorter period of time than

Europeans have lived in Europe. Yet a Scottish councillor, Sandy Aitchison, was chastised for using the term “indigenous” about native Brits. Why is it considered ridiculous or evil if Europeans assert our rights? Is it because we are white? Everybody’s supposed to keep their culture, except people of European origins? Is that it? Why is colonialism bad, except when my country, which has no colonial history, gets colonized by Third World peoples?

Western Europeans have in recent years accepted more immigration in a shorter period of time than any society has ever done peacefully in human history. If we want a break we have the right to do so. What we are dealing with is not “immigration” but colonization, and in the case of Muslims, internationally organized attempts to conquer of our countries. If non-Europeans have the right to resist colonization then so do Europeans.

I like cultural diversity and would hope this could be extended to include my culture, too. Or is Multiculturalism simply a hate ideology designed to unilaterally dismantle European culture and the peoples who created it? If people in Cameroon or Cambodia can keep their culture, why can’t the peoples who produced Beethoven, Newton, Copernicus, Michelangelo and Louis Pasteur do the same? As Rabbi Aryeh Spero points out, European elites insist “on the primacy of indigenous cultures and religions when speaking of other faraway regions, yet find such insistence arrogant when it concerns the indigenous culture of its own lands.”

Yes, a little immigration from compatible cultures can be absorbed, and can be beneficial on certain terms. But what we are dealing with now is not from compatible cultures and it certainly isn’t little. My nation runs a very real risk of being demographically wiped out during this century, as do the other Nordic countries. We will go from being among the most successful societies in human history to being eradicated in the space of a few generations if current levels of immigration continue. Do I have the right to worry about this, or is that “racist”?

The author Gore Vidal once stated: “Norway is large enough and empty enough to take in 40 to 50 million homeless Bengalis. If the Norwegians say that, all in all, they would rather not take them in, is this to be considered racism? I think not. It is simply self-preservation, the first law of species.” Thomas Jefferson said that “The law of self-preservation is higher than written law,” and he was right.

As I wrote two years ago: “By any standards possible, we’re one of the most successful cultures in the world, our largest flaw, which could eventually bury us, probably being our naivety. So why on earth should we quietly watch while our country is subdued by the most unsuccessful cultures in the world? The most basic instinct of all living things, even down to bacteria level, is self-preservation. In 2006, you have a natural right to self-preservation if you are an amoeba, but not if you’re a Scandinavian. Maybe the solution then is to argue that Scandinavians are indeed a species of amoebas, and that we need special protection by the WWF. We could showcase some of our finest specimen of Leftist intellectuals and journalists to prove our point. Shouldn’t be too hard.”

For simply suggesting that I would not enjoy being turned into a persecuted minority in my own country, I have been accused of being a “white nationalist,” which says a great deal about how demonized people of European ancestry have become. What about Koreans or Japanese? If they were gradually being displaced by, say, Nigerians and Pakistanis and were harassed in their cities by people who moved there out of their own free will, would they be denounced as yellow nationalists if they objected to this? In fact, why do the terms yellow nationalist, brown nationalist and black nationalist hardly exist, whereas the term white nationalist does? Isn’t that by itself an indication of a double standard?

I started out initially writing almost exclusively about Islam, and I still write predominantly about Islam. However, I have gradually realized that we are dealing with an entire regime of censorship that needs to be removed before we can deal with Islam. I will in any situation highlight and support the struggle of Buddhists, Hindus, Sikhs, Baha’is, Jews, African Christians, Chinese Taoists etc. against Islamic Jihad, which is a global fight. I always have and I always will. The one thing I will not do is surrender my land, which is not mine to give. I do not see anybody else quietly accept being turned into a minority in the country where their ancestors have lived since the end of the last Ice Age, and I cannot see why I should have to do so, either. I don’t care if white Westerners are “scared of being called a racist.” I will not leave a ruined land behind to my descendants because I was afraid of being called bad names. If you think it is “racist” for Europeans to preserve their

heritage and protect their children from abuse, then I'm not the bigot here. You are.

I hereby propose that native Europeans should create a European Indigenous People's Movement, on behalf of the traditional majority populations of Britain, Germany, France, Italy, Spain, Sweden, Austria, Belgium, the Netherlands, Denmark etc., inspired by the [Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples](#). The European Indigenous People's Movement should support the right of Europe's indigenous peoples to preserve their self-determination, traditions, sovereignty and culture as majority peoples in their own lands.

The list of goals and objectives should include:

- 1.) The right to maintain our traditional majorities in our own lands, control our own sovereignty and our own self-determination. We do not wish harm or ill-feeling toward any other peoples on earth, but we assert the right to maintain our own majorities in our own lands without being accused of "racism." We reject current trends which preach that we have no right to oppose, control or lessen unlimited immigration from non-indigenous cultures.
- 2.) The right to teach our children our cultures, languages, historical interpretations, religious celebrations and traditions unimpeded. We reject educational trends which encourage our children to forget or despise their culture, traditions, religious practices and history in order to avoid offense to non-indigenous European residents or citizens.
- 3.) The right to maintain, cherish and practice our own indigenous religious holidays and celebrations. We reject out of hand current trends which preach that traditional indigenous European religious or cultural celebrations such as Christmas are somehow "racist" or "non-inclusive" and therefore must be "downgraded," "renamed" or otherwise de-emphasized or eliminated in order to avoid offending non-indigenous European residents or citizens. We reject current policies which establish that our indigenous cultures are somehow deficient and therefore are not complete until they are "enriched" by other, non-indigenous cultures.
- 4.) The right to maintain, cherish and display our own indigenous religious, national, ethnic and cultural symbols. We reject out of hand current trends or policies which preach that our national flags or ethnic symbols of centuries standing are somehow "racist" or "non-inclusive" in order to avoid offense to non-indigenous European residents or citizens.
- 5.) The right to maintain, cherish, protect and display our own indigenous cultural expressions such as music, artwork and sculptures. We reject out of hand current trends or policies which preach that indigenous European cultural expressions such as statues of boars, folkloric tales about pigs or dogs, paintings with Christian or Classical pagan themes, war memorials with a Christian theme, etc., should be removed from public view, banned, destroyed, modified or otherwise threatened in order to avoid offense to non-indigenous European residents or citizens.
- 6.) The right to maintain, cherish and protect indigenous burial sites, structures, buildings, churches, museums and other public works and structures from destruction, modification or other changes. We reject out of hand current trends or policies which establish that indigenous public works and structures must be changed or modified to avoid offense to non-indigenous European residents or citizens, or to "make way" for structures or public works that benefit non-European residents or citizens (i.e. digging up indigenous graves that are centuries old in order to "make room" for non-indigenous cemeteries, removing external Christian symbols and statues from churches, etc.)

Mr. Franco Frattini of the EU Commission, the unelected and unaccountable government for nearly half a billion people, has stated that Europeans should accept further tens of millions of immigrants within a generation. The British Foreign Minister Milliband stated late in 2007 that the EU should expand to include Muslim nations in North Africa and the Middle East. The French President Sarkozy and the German Chancellor Angela Merkel [confirmed this](#) early in 2008. This is part of an organized attempt to surrender Europe to Islamization that has been going on for decades. Since the European Union involves the free movement of people across borders, European leaders are opening [the floodgates](#) to tens of millions of Muslims and other non-indigenous peoples at a time when native Europeans fear for the survival of their civilization and feel like aliens in their own cities. Meanwhile, [Ernst Uhrlau](#), the president of Germany's foreign intelligence agency, warned about the rising assertiveness of [violent Jihadist](#) organizations in North

Africa.

Based on this evidence, the European Union can hardly be seen as anything other than a criminal organization dedicated to the demographic dispossession and cultural marginalization of the indigenous peoples of an entire continent. Consequently, the EU should be immediately and totally dissolved. Europe is being targeted with coordinated Islamic efforts aimed at the elimination of our freedoms. We are being subject to a foreign invasion, and aiding and abetting a foreign invasion in any way constitutes treason.

Native Europeans should demand that we have an interim period with public de-Eurabification, where the lies propagated by pro-Islamic Multiculturalists should be removed from our history books, and a proper respect for European cultural traditions should be restored. Those officials on senior levels who have participated in the creation of Eurabia should stand trial for crimes against their civilization.

## Can The West Be Saved?

by Serge Trifkovic

May 2008

***Serge Trifkovic is a Serbian-born American historian and political analyst. He is the author of several books, among them Defeating Jihad: How the War on Terrorism Can Be Won — in Spite of Ourselves and The Sword of the Prophet: Islam; History, Theology, Impact on the World. He is currently foreign affairs editor for the conservative monthly “Chronicles: A Magazine of American Culture.” This essay is republished here with his permission.***

“Europe today is a powder keg,” Otto von Bismarck remarked, “and the leaders are like men smoking in an arsenal.”

I am not going to waste your time tonight with yet another treatise on why Islam is **not** the Religion of Peace, Tolerance, Compassion, etc, etc. We are beyond that. Had America agonized, in the aftermath of Pearl Harbor, whether Shinto was actually OK but only Bushido was bad, the Greater Asian Co-prosperity Sphere would be going strong to this day. Among reasonable people, unblinkered by the dicta of political correctness, the real score on Muhammad and his followers is well known. It has been known for centuries. That score, however, no matter how calmly stated and comprehensively supported, invariably elicits the howls of “Islamophobia” from the neoliberal elite class.

### AN EMINENTLY POSTMODERN LITTLE PHOBIA

In the way of an introduction, let us therefore look at the formal, legally tested definition of that word, the latest addition to the arsenal of postmodern “phobias.” It is provided by the European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia (EUMC) based here in Vienna. (“Orwellian” is a worn-out adjective, but it simply has to be used in connection with this particular institution.) The EUMC diligently tracks the instances of “Islamophobia” all over the Old Continent, which it defines by eight red flags:

1. Islam is seen as a monolithic bloc, static and unresponsive to change.
2. Islam is seen as separate and “Other.”
3. Islam is seen as inferior to the West, barbaric, irrational, primitive and sexist.
4. Islam is seen as violent, aggressive, linked to terrorism, engaged in a clash of civilizations.
5. Islam is seen as a political ideology.
6. Criticisms made of the West by Islam are rejected out of hand.
7. Discriminatory practices and Muslims’ exclusion from mainstream society are advocated.
8. Anti-Muslim hostility is seen as natural or normal.

This definition is obviously intended to preclude any possibility of meaningful discussion of Islam. As it happens,

1. That Islam is static and unresponsive to change is evident from the absence of an internal, orthodox critique of jihad, sharia, jizya, etc. As Clement Huart pointed out back in 1907, “Until the newer conceptions, as to what the Koran teaches as to the duty of the believer towards non-believers, have spread further and have more generally leavened the mass of Moslem belief and opinion, it is the older and orthodox standpoint on this question which must be regarded by non-Moslems as representing Mohammedan teaching and as guiding Mohammedan action.” A century later his diagnosis still stands: it is not the jihadists who are “distorting” Islam; the would-be reformers are.
2. That Islam is separate from our Western, Christian, European culture and civilization, and “other” than our culture and civilization, is a fact that will not change even if Europe eventually succumbs to the ongoing jihadist demographic onslaught.



3. Whether Islam is “inferior to the West” is a matter of opinion, of course. That Islam cannot create a prosperous, harmonious, stable, creative, and attractive human society is not. Whether Islam is “barbaric, irrational, primitive and sexist” is at least debatable; but that many of its tangible fruits *are so*, is all too painfully visible.
4. Islam is seen by so many as “violent, aggressive, supportive of terrorism” not because of some irrational “phobia” in the feverish mind of the beholder, but because (a) of the clear mandate of its scripture; (b) of the record of its 14 centuries of historical practice; and above all (c) of the timeless example of its founder.
5. “Islam is seen as a political ideology,” and it should be seen as one, because its key trait is a *political* program to improve man and create a new society; to impose complete control over that society; and to train cadres ready and eager to spill blood. This makes Islam closer to Bolshevism and to National Socialism than to any other religion. It breeds a gnostic paradigm within which the standard response to the challenge presented by “the Other,” i.e. non-Muslim societies and cultures, is implacable hostility and violence, or violent intent.
6. Criticisms made of the West by Islam should not be rejected out of hand; they should be *understood*. Its chief “criticism” of the West—and of every other non-Islamic culture or tradition—is that it is *infidel*, and therefore undeserving of existence.
7. A priori hostility towards Islam should not be “used to justify discriminatory practices towards Muslims.” Quite the contrary, an education campaign about the teaching and practice of Islam should result in legislative action that would exclude Islam from the societies it is targeting — not because it is an intolerant “religion,” but because it is *an inherently seditious totalitarian ideology* incompatible with the values of the West.
8. And finally, while *anti-Muslim hostility* is not a priori “natural or normal,” the desire of non-Muslims to defend their lands, families, cultures and faith against Islamic aggression *is* “natural and normal”; but the elite class is actively trying to neutralize it.

As the demand for Sharia-based communal self-rule is made with increasing frequency in the banlieus of Paris and the grim West Midlands council estates, Europe’s elite class is ready to throw in the towel. Dutch Justice Minister Piet Hein Donner—a Christian Democrat!—sees the demand as perfectly legitimate and argues that sharia could be introduced “by democratic means.” Muslims have a right to follow the commands of their religion, even if that included some “dissenting rules of behavior”: “Could you block this legally? It would also be a scandal to say ‘this isn’t allowed’! The majority counts. That is the essence of democracy...”

#### GUILT-RIDDEN FELLOW-TRAVELLERS

Such inanities are light years away from Winston Churchill’s warning, over a century ago, that “no stronger retrograde force exists in the world” than Islam:

Far from being moribund, Mohammedanism is a militant and proselytizing faith. It has already spread throughout Central Africa, raising fearless warriors at every step; and were it not that Christianity is sheltered in the strong arms of science—the science against which it had vainly struggled—the civilization of modern Europe might fall, as fell the civilization of ancient Rome.

Even Churchill’s prescience could not envisage the possibility that the invader would find his fellow-travellers at No. 10, Downing Street, at the European Union headquarters in Brussels, and in dozens of chancelleries and palaces across the Old Continent. Their joint efforts are helping change the face of Europe. The cumulative effect is not in doubt: by 2050, Muslims will account for over one-third of “Old Europe’s” young residents. Millions of them already live in a parallel universe that has very little to do with the host country, toward which they have a disdainful and hostile attitude.

The elite class responds to such hostility with calls for ever-greater inclusiveness. Giuseppe Pisanu, Berlusconi’s former minister of the interior, responsible for controlling the country’s borders, thus declared five years ago that the high fatality rate of North African illegals on the high seas en route to Sicily was “a

dreadful tragedy that weighs on the conscience of Europe.” His view was paradigmatic of the utopian liberal mind-set. If “Europe” should feel shame and guilt that people who have no right to come to its shores are risking their lives while trying to do so illegally, then only the establishment of a free passenger-ferry service between Tripoli and Palermo-with no passport or customs formalities required upon arrival, and a free shuttle to Rome or Milan-would offer some relief to that burdened conscience. And Sr Pisanu is supposedly a man of the “Right”!

The tangible results of the leaders’ moral decrepitude are devastating. A century ago, Sr. Pisanu and his class shared social commonalities that could be observed in Monte Carlo, Carlsbad, Biarritz or Paris, depending on the season. Englishmen, Russians, and Austrians shared the same outlook and sense of propriety, they all spoke French, but they nevertheless remained rooted in their national traditions, the permanent vessels in which *Weltanschauung* could be translated into *Kultur*. Today’s “United Europe,” by contrast, does not create social and civilizational commonalities except on the basis of wholesale denial of old mores, disdain for inherited values, and an overt rejection of “traditional” culture. It creates the dreary sameness of “antidiscriminationism” and “tolerance.”

Such weakness breeds contempt and haughty arrogance on the other side. Take Tariq Ramadan, who calmly insists that Muslims in the West should conduct themselves as though they were already living in a Muslim-majority society and were exempt on that account from having to make concessions to the faith of the host-society. Muslims in Europe should feel entitled to live on their own terms, Ramadan says, while, “under the terms of Western liberal tolerance,” society as a whole should be “obliged to respect that choice.”

If such “respect” continues to be extended by the elite class, by the end of this century there will be no “Europeans” as members of ethnic groups that share the same language, culture, history, and ancestors, and inhabit lands associated with their names. The shrinking native populations will be indoctrinated into believing-or else simply forced into accepting-that the demographic shift in favor of unassimilable and hostile aliens is actually a blessing that enriches their culturally deprived and morally unsustainable societies. The “liberal tolerance” and the accompanying “societal obligation” that Tariq Ramadan invokes thus become the tools of Western suicide. “No other race subscribes to these moral principles,” Jean Raspail wrote a generation ago, “because they are weapons of self-annihilation.” The weapons need to be discarded, and the upholders of those deadly “principles” removed from all positions of power and influence, if Europe is to survive.

#### THE PATHOLOGY OF THE ELITE CLASS

It is in the inability and unwillingness of the neoliberal elite class to confront the grave threat to our civilization that Western Europe and North America most tellingly certify that they share the same cultural chromosomes. In 1938 Hilaire Belloc wondered, “Will not perhaps the temporal power of Islam return and with it the menace of an armed Muhammadan world which will shake the dominion of Europeans-still nominally Christian-and reappear again as the prime enemy of our civilization?”

Seven decades later, the same traits of decrepitude are present in Great Britain, France, Germany, Italy, Scandinavia, Canada, and the United States, including both the primary cause, which is *the loss of religious faith*, and several secondary ones. Topping the list is elite hostility to all forms of solidarity of the majority population based on shared historical memories, ancestors, and common culture; the consequences are predictable:

- the loss of a sense of place and history among Europeans and North Americans;
- rapid demographic decline, especially in Europe, unparalleled in history;
- rampant Third World (and in Europe, overwhelmingly Muslim) immigration;
- collapse of private and public manners, morals, and traditional commonalities;
- imposition of “diversity,” “multiculturalism,” “sensitivity”; and
- demonization and criminalization of any opposition to any of the above.

The end-result is the Westerners’ loss of the sense of propriety over their lands. Before 1914, both the West and the Muslim world could define themselves against each other in a cultural sense. The neoliberal elite

insists on casting aside any idea of a specifically “Western” geographic and cultural space that should be protected from those who do not belong to it and have no rightful claim to it. The elite insists that our countries belong to the whole world.

We face an elite consensus that *de facto* open immigration, multiculturalism, and the existence of a large Muslim diaspora within the Western world are to be treated as a fixed and immutable fact that must not be scrutinized. That consensus, I contend, is ideological in nature, flawed in logic, dogmatic in application, and disastrous in its results. It needs to be tested against *evidence*, and not against the alleged norms of acceptable public discourse imposed by those who do not know Islam, or else do not want us to know the truth about it.

In addition, a depraved mass culture and multiculturalist indoctrination in state schools and the mainstream media have already largely neutralized the sense of historical and cultural continuity among young West Europeans and North Americans. By contrast, the blend of soft porn and consumerism that targets every denizen of the Western world has not had the same effect on the Muslim diaspora in the West. The roll-call of Western-born and educated young Muslims supportive of terrorism confirms that failure.

The loss of a sense of place and history experienced by millions of Westerners follows the emergence of two sides of the same coin: a neoliberal post-national hyper-state in Europe and the neoconservative “benevolent global hegemony” in the U.S. epitomized by the demand for an ever-growing NATO. These two mindsets, seemingly at odds, are but two aspects of the same emerging globalized universe, two sides of the same coin. The neoliberals advocate multilateralism in the form of an emerging “international community” framed by the United Nations and adjudicated by the International Criminal Court (ICC), with the EU acting as an interim medium for transferring sovereign prerogatives to a supra-national body; the neocons prefer to be the only cop in town. Both share the same distaste for traditional, naturally evolving societies and cultures.

The revolutionary character of the multiculturalist project is revealed in the endless mantra of *Race*, *Gender* and *Sexuality*, the formula now elevated to the status of the post-modern Philosopher’s Stone, the force that moves the linear historical process forward, towards the grand *Gleichschaltung* of nations, races, and cultures that will mark the end of history. Race, Gender and Sexuality have replaced the Proletariat as both the oppressed underclass (hence the cult of the non-white, non-male, non-heterosexual victimhood), and as the historically preordained agent of revolutionary change.

Classical Marxist political economy found the dynamics of revolution in the inevitable conflict between the owners of the means of production and the proletariat that has nothing to sell but its labor and nothing to lose but its chains. Latter-day Marxist revolutionaries go beyond dialectical materialism, however, by introducing a wholly metaphysical concept of victimhood and an array of associated special-rights claims that have worked such wonders for Islam all over the Western world. Majority populations of “old” Europe and America, in this insane but all-pervasive paradigm, are guilty of “oppression” by their very existence, and therefore must not protest the migratory deluge, let alone try to oppose it: that is “racism.”

The fruits are with us already. Gibbon could have had today’s Antwerp or Malmo in mind, or Marseilles, or Huddersfield, when he wrote of Rome in decline, its masses morphing “into a vile and wretched populace.” On present form, within a century the native Western majorities will melt away: “child-free” is a legitimate yuppie lifestyle term, on par with “fat-free” and “drug-free.” But whereas the threat of extinction of an exotic tribal group in Borneo or Amazonia — let alone a species of spotted owl or sperm whale — would cause alarm and prompt activism among neoliberal elites, it is deemed inherently racist to mention the fact that Europeans and their trans-Atlantic cousins are, literally, endangered species.

There will be no grand synthesis, no civilizational cross-fertilization, between the West and Islam. Even the ultra-tolerant Dutch are beginning to see the light, *pace* Geert Wilders, but they are hamstrung by guilt-ridden self-haters and appeasers, whose hold on the political power, the media, and the academe is undemocratic, unnatural, and obscene. If Europe is to survive they need to be unmasked for what they are: traitors to their nations and their culture. They must be replaced by people ready and willing to subject the issues of immigration and identity to the test of democracy, unhindered by administrative or judicial fiat.

If the coming war against jihad is to be won, the first task is to start talking frankly about the identity and character of the enemy and the nature of the threat. The obligation to do so is dictated by morality no less than

by the need for self-preservation. “If you know the enemy and know yourself you need not fear the results of a hundred battles,” says Sun Tzu. Well, we know the enemy. We know his core beliefs, his role models, his track-record, his mindset, his *modus operandi*, and his intentions. We also know his weaknesses, which are many, above all his inability to develop a prosperous economy or a functional, harmonious society.

The main problem is with ourselves; or, to be precise, with those among us who have the power to make policy and shape opinions, and who will reject and condemn our diagnosis. Having absorbed postmodernist relativism, certain only of uncertainty, devoid of any faith except the faith in their own infallibility, *members of the Western neoliberal elite class treat the jihadist mindset as a problem that can and should be treated by treating causes external to Islam itself*. The result is a plethora of proposed “cures” that are as likely to succeed in making us safe from terrorism as snake oil is likely to cure leukemia.

Abroad, we are told, we need to address political and economic grievances of the Muslim impoverished masses, we need to spread democracy and free markets in the Muslim world, we need to invest more in public diplomacy. At home we need more tolerance, greater inclusiveness, less profiling, and a more determined outreach to the minorities that feel marginalized. The predictable failure of such cures leads to ever more pathological self-scrutiny and to ever more morbid self-doubt. This vicious circle must be broken.

### BREAKING THE DEADLOCK

The deadlock on the Somme in 1916, or at Verdun a year later, could not be broken with the ideas and *modus operandi* of Messrs. Haig, Foch, Cadrona or Hindenburg. It could have been unlocked, however, had Lidell-Hart, de Gaulle, or Guderian held the old guard’s ranks and positions. Winning a war demands “knowing the enemy and knowing oneself,” of course, but it also demands “thinking outside the box.” This cliché is apt: the magnitude of the threat demands *radical responses* that fall outside the cognitive parameters of the elite class.

Let us therefore start our specific policy recommendations with the complex and emotionally charged issue of “human rights” versus national security.

**DEFINING ISLAMIC ACTIVISM** — Instead of seeking a ban on all Muslim immigration right away, which is not a realistic goal at this moment, Western anti-jihadist activists should campaign for changes in immigration legislation of their home countries to include clauses that would exclude Islamic activists before they come, and have them deported if they are already infiltrated into the country.

This demand needs to be made acceptable and attractive to a wide cross-section of the electorate regardless of political and ideological preferences. Therefore it should be focused on the Islamic activists’ threat to the neoliberal values themselves:

- Discrimination against other religions (with special emphasis on the rising European phenomenon of Islamic anti-Semitism), outlooks (inc. atheism) and lifestyles;
- Discrimination and violence against women (esp. wives and “disobedient” daughters);
- Discrimination and violence against homosexuals;
- Threats of violence in any form and for whatever alleged “offense” or “insult” (e.g. drawing cartoons, making documentaries, writing books);
- Apology or justification for all of the above.

It is essential to focus on the despicable acts themselves, and then drawing the direct line to the commands of Islam’s scripture and its founder, rather than doing it in reverse, as some well-meaning but politically less astute anti-jihadist activists do.

This definition of Islamic activism would be a major step in the direction of denying actual or potential jihadists a foothold in Europe and the rest of the West. In the U.S. the broad model is provided by the old 1952 Immigration and Nationality Act (INA, the McCarran-Walter Act), mandating the exclusion or deportation of any alien who engaged or had purpose to engage in activities prejudicial to the public interest or subversive to

national security. “Ideological” grounds for deportation were on the US statute books until 1990, when they were repealed by Congress. After the Russian revolution foreign communists were singled out for deportation. One night alone in January of 1920, more than 2,500 “alien radicals” were seized in thirty-three cities across the country and deported to their countries of origin.

**DENYING CITIZENSHIP TO ISLAMIC ACTIVISTS** — I submit to you that all Western countries need laws that will treat any naturalized citizen’s or legally resident alien’s known adherence to an Islamist world outlook as *excludable - onpolitical*, rather than “religious” grounds. It is politically feasible to articulate the demand that citizenship of a democratic Western country should be denied to all Islamic activists.

In the United States a foreigner who becomes naturalized has to declare, on oath, “that I absolutely and entirely renounce and abjure all allegiance and fidelity to any foreign prince, potentate, state, or sovereignty of whom or which I have heretofore been a subject or citizen; that I will support and defend the Constitution and laws of the United States of America against all enemies, foreign and domestic.” A declaration of this kind, of not a solemn oath of allegiance, is expected from naturalized citizens in most European countries.

For a Muslim to declare all of the above in good faith, and especially that he accepts an “infidel,” i.e. non-Muslim document or law as the source of his highest loyalty, is an act of apostasy *par excellence*, punishable by death under the Islamic law. The *sharia*, to a Muslim, is not an addition to the “secular” legal code with which it coexists; it is the only *true* code, the only basis of obligation. To be legitimate, all political power therefore must rest exclusively with those who enjoy Allah’s authority on the basis of his revealed will — and for as long as they remain infidel, both Europe and America are illegitimate. So how can a self-avowedly devout Muslim take the oath, and expect the rest of us to believe that it was done in good faith? Because he is practicing *taqiyya*, the art of elaborate lying that was inaugurated by Muhammad to help destabilize and undermine non-Muslim communities almost ripe for a touch of Jihad. (Or else because he is not devout enough and confused, but in that case there is the ever-present danger that at some point he will rediscover his roots.)

**AUXILLIARY MEASURES** — Those who preach or promote jihad and advocate the introduction of sharia can and should be treated in exactly the same manner that adherents of other totalitarian ideologies had been treated in the free world during the Cold War. It will be a long and hard struggle to open the eyes of legislators and legal regulators that Islam itself is a radical, revolutionary ideology, inherently seditious and inimical to Western values and institutions, but it can be done. Other necessary measures would then follow, but to that end anti-jihadists should start articulating and advocating them now:

1. **Seek zero porosity of the borders.** Preventing illegal immigration is a desirable objective *per se*; in the context of stopping terrorists it is mandatory. No anti-jihadist strategy is possible without complete physical control of borders. This is an issue on which a majority of the electorate of each and every Western country will agree — much to the chagrin of the liberal elites. Anti-jihadists should insist that all illegal immigration is a major *security* threat and that it can and should be subject to the letter of the law, and not to the suicidal dictates of the “human rights” lobby.
2. **Demand mandatory cooperation of state agencies at all levels** in identifying, registering and apprehending illegal immigrants and in assisting in their deportation — starting with those from nations and groups at risk for terrorism. It is a curious phenomenon in most Western countries that at various levels of state administration (e.g. welfare officers and social workers) and law enforcement (e.g. police forces in major cities) we encounter varying levels of tolerance, and even encouragement, of illegal immigrants’ continued presence in the community. Again, this demand for simple compliance with the law by tax-funded public officers would be politically popular.
3. **Discard the irrational ban on “profiling.”** Not all Muslims are terrorists, of course, but all transnational terrorist networks that threaten Western countries’ national security and way of life are composed of Muslims. It is time to accept that “profiling” based on a person’s appearance, origin, and apparent or suspected beliefs is an essential tool of trade of law enforcement and war on terrorism. Just ask the Israelis!



4. **Subject the work of Islamic centers to legal limitations and security supervision.** All over the Western world, Islamic centers have provided platforms for exhortations to the faithful to support causes and to engage in acts that are morally reprehensible, legally punishable, and detrimental to the host country's national security. They have provided shelter to the outlaws, and offered recruitment to the leaders.
5. **Treat affiliation with Islamic activism as grounds for denial or revoking of any level of security clearance.** Such affiliation is incompatible with the requirements of personal commitment, patriotic loyalty and unquestionable reliability that are essential in the military, law enforcement, intelligence services, and other related branches of government (e.g. immigration control, airport security). Presence of practicing Muslims in any of these institutions would present an inherent risk to its integrity and would undermine morale.

Acceptance of these proposals would represent a new start in devising long-term defense. The proposed measures recognize that we are in a war of ideas and religion, whether we want that or not and however much we hate the fact. They reflect the seriousness of the struggle. This war is being fought, on the Islamic side, with the deep condition that the West is on its last legs. The success of its demographic onslaught on Europe enhances the image of "a candy store with the busted lock," and that view is reinforced by the evidence from history that a civilization that loses the urge for self-perpetuation is indeed in peril.

#### CAN THE CANDY STORE WITH A BUSTED LOCK BE SAVED?

The above proposals are not only pragmatic, they are morally just. They will elicit the accusation of "discrimination" from the self-hating segments of the elite class, even though no such label is applicable. Targeting people for screening, supervision and exclusion on the basis of their genes would be discriminatory indeed, but doing so because of their beliefs, ideas, actions, and intentions is justified and necessary. Orthodox Islamic beliefs, ideas and intentions *as such* pose a threat to the European civilization, culture, and way of life.

The elite class rejects this diagnosis, of course, but among reasonable, well-informed citizens the debate must be conducted on terms liberated from the shackles of the elite class. Geert Wilders certainly shows the way. We should act accordingly, and never, ever be afraid of causing controversy. That means being subjected to the threat of legal proceedings by the neoliberal state — or to the threat of death, by those whom the neoliberal state continues to protect to the detriment of its own citizens.

Western leaders did not agonize over communism's "true" nature during the Berlin air lift in 1949, or in Korea in 1950, but acted effectively to contain it by whatever means necessary. Yes, back then we had a legion of Moscow's apologists, character witnesses, moles and fellow-travelers, assuring us that the Comrades want nothing but social justice at home and peaceful coexistence abroad. They held tenured chairs at prestigious universities and dominated all smart salons, from London and Paris to New York. They explained away and justified the inconsistencies and horrifyingly violent implications of the source texts of Marx and Lenin. They explained away and justified the appalling fruits: the bloodbath of the Revolution, the genocidal great famine, the show trials and purges, the killing of millions of innocents in the Gulag, the pact with Hitler, the works.

Today their spiritual heirs in politics, the academy and the media establishment act as Islam's apologists, character witnesses and fellow travelers. They flatly deny or else explain away, with identical scholastic sophistry and moral depravity, the dark and violent implications of the source texts, the Kuran and the Hadith, the deeply unnerving career of Muhammad, and centuries of conquests, wars, slaughters, subjugation, decline without fall, spiritual and material misery, and murderous fanaticism.

#### NIL DESPERANDUM!

Some eighty years ago Julien Benda published his tirade against the intellectual corruption of his times, *The treason of the intellectuals*. For generations prior to the 20th century, Benda wrote, members of the Western intellectual elite ensured that "humanity did evil, but honored good." The "Treason" of the title occurred when they gave up promoting lasting civilizational values in favor of short-term political preferences. Benda wrote at a time when fascism, nazism and bolshevism dominated Europe's scene. Today the "treason" of the elite class takes a different form. It upholds the allegedly universal values of multiculturalism, inclusiveness and

antidiscriminationism to the detriment of the particular value of our civilization and all its fruits. The propensity of the elite class to the betrayal of our culture remains the same, however.

The fact that normal people don't realize the magnitude of the problem works to the advantage of the people like Solana, Soros, Blair, Prodi, or Hillary Clinton. Their ideas, which but two generations ago would have been deemed eccentric or insane, now rule the Euro-American mainstream. Only a society inured to the concept of open borders can be unblinkingly told that Islam is good and tolerant, that "we" (the West) have been nasty and unkind to it over the centuries — remember the Crusades! — and that "terrorism" needs to be understood, and cured, by social therapy that is independent of Islam's teaching and practice.

At the root of the domestic malaise is the notion that countries do not belong to the people who have inhabited them for generations, but to whoever happens to be within their boundaries at any given moment in time — regardless of his culture, attitude, or intentions. The resulting random melange of mutually disconnected multitudes is supposed to be a blessing that enriches an otherwise arid and monotonous society.

A further pernicious fallacy is the dictum that we should not feel a special bond for any particular country, nation, race, or culture, but transfer our preferences on the whole world, "the Humanity," equally. Such notions have been internalized by the elite class in America and Western Europe to the point where they actively help Islamic terrorism. In America the process has been under way for decades. By 1999 then-Deputy Secretary of State Strobe Talbott felt ready to declare that the United States may not exist "in its current form" in the 21st century, because the very concept of nationhood — here and throughout the world — will have been rendered obsolete.

A generation earlier such uttering from a senior government official would have caused a scandal. By the end of the 20th century such declarations bothered only the unsophisticates who persist in assuming that the purpose of what Dr. Talbott was doing at the Department of State was to ensure the survival, security and prosperity of the United States *within* the international system, rather than its eventual absorption *by* the system. But his was an exultant prophecy, not an impartial assessment. The ideological foundation for Talbott's beliefs was stated bluntly: "All countries are basically social arrangements, accommodations to changing circumstances. No matter how permanent and even sacred they may seem at any one time, in fact they are all artificial and temporary." To the members of his class, all countries are but transient, virtual-reality entities. Owing emotional allegiance to any one of them is irrational, and risking one's life for its sake is absurd.

The refusal of the Western elite class to protect their nations from jihadist infiltration is the biggest betrayal in history. It is rooted in the mindset that breeds the claim that "force is not an answer" to terrorism, that profiling is bad and open borders are good, that "true" Islam is peaceful and the West is wicked. The upholders of such claims belong to the culture that has lost its bond with nature, history, and the supporting community. In the meantime, thanks to them, the quiet onslaught continues unabated, across the Straits of Gibraltar, through JFK and O'Hare, Heathrow and Schiphol. Far from enhancing diversity, it threatens to impose a numbing sameness and eradicate the identity of target-populations, to demolish their special character and uniqueness.

That supporting community, the real nation, is still out there, in North America and Europe alike, working and paying taxes and grinning and bearing it. When it is told of Islam's "peace and tolerance," it grumbles about someone's stupidity or ineptitude, but it still does not suspect outright betrayal. The betrayers, meanwhile, promote an ideology of universal human values, of a common culture for the whole world. They may not even realize why they abet Islam. For all the outward differences, they share with the mullahs and sheikhs and imams the desire for a monistic One World. They both long for Talbot's Single Global Authority, post-national and seamlessly standardized, an *Ummah* under a fancy secular name.

Those Americans and Europeans who love their lands and nations more than any others, and who put their families and their neighborhoods before all others, are normal people. Those who tell them that their attachments should be global and that their lands and neighborhoods belong to the whole world are sick and evil. They are our enemies and jihad's indispensable objective allies.

The elite class, rootless, arrogant, cynically manipulative, has every intention of continuing to "fight" the war on terrorism without naming the enemy, without revealing his beliefs, without unmasking his intentions,

without offending his accomplices, without expelling his fifth columnists, and without ever daring to win.

It is up to the millions of normal Europeans and their American cousins to stop the madness. The traitor class wants them to share its death wish, to self-annihilate as people with a historical memory and a cultural identity, and to make room for the post-human, monistic Utopia spearheaded by the jihadist fifth column.

This crime can and must be stopped. The founders of the United States overthrew the colonial government for offenses far lighter than those of which the traitor class is guilty.

## Suggestions for the Future

*Published at the Gates of Vienna blog in September 2008; republished with some changes here.*

This essay overlaps to some extent with the essay [Recommendations for the West](#) from 2006. How should we respond to the threats our civilization is facing? First of all, ordinary citizens should take steps to protect their own security since crime and violence is spreading fast throughout the Western world. Second, we need to reclaim pride in our heritage, which has been lost or taken from us in recent years, and restore a proper teaching of this in the education system. We should assume that our leaders are not telling us the full truth about the scale of mass immigration.

Journalist [Nick Fagge](#) wrote the following in newspaper the *Daily Express* in October 2008:

“MORE than 50 million African workers are to be invited to Europe in a far-reaching secretive migration deal, the Daily Express can reveal today. A controversial taxpayer-funded ‘job centre’ opened in Mali this week is just the first step towards promoting ‘free movement of people in Africa and the EU’. Brussels economists claim Britain and other EU states will ‘need’ 56 million immigrant workers between them by 2050 to make up for the ‘demographic decline’ due to falling birth rates and rising death rates across Europe. The report, by the EU statistical agency Eurostat, warns that vast numbers of migrants could be needed to meet the shortfall in two years if Europe is to have a hope of funding the pension and health needs of its growing elderly population. It states:...‘Having sufficient people of working age is vital for the economy and for tax revenue.’ The report, by French MEP Francoise Castex, calls for immigrants to be given legal rights and access to social welfare provision such as benefits. Ms Castex said: ‘It is urgent that member states have a calm approach to immigration. To say ‘yes’, we need immigration ...is not a new development, we must accept it.”

Unlimited mass immigration would destabilize cities that are already swamped in crime. Besides, we are real, physically existing peoples, nations, and countries, not walking tax revenue. We are told that the ongoing mass immigration from alien cultures is “good for the economy.” This is demonstrably false and resembles the “Big Lie” technique employed by the Nazis. Even if it were true, I would still reject this argument. I am not willing to give up our existence as a people in the hypothetical hope that doing so would earn us a few more electronic toys, of which we already have plenty. The notion that man is *homo economicus*, the economic man, nothing more than the sum of his functions as a worker and consumer, is widely shared by left-wingers and many right-wingers today. It is one of the most destructive ideologies of our time and needs to be defeated while there is still something left of European civilization to preserve. You cannot put a prize tag on your cultural identity and the heritage of your ancestors. I want my children to grow up in a country that is theirs, with a sense of belonging to a community with deep historical roots.

One “anti-Jihadist” in Scandinavia once indicated that it was OK with a Muslim majority in Europe as long as these Muslims respect “human rights.” They won’t, of course, but that’s not the point. The “debate” we have is between those who believe we should accept unlimited mass immigration and those who believe we should accept unlimited mass immigration as long as those who replace us believe in “human rights,” where the former group views the latter as “racists.” At no point is there any debate of whether native Europeans have the right to preserve our cultures and historical identities.

Globalism is the enemy within which needs to be defeated. Globalism does not refer to the impersonal forces of technological globalization (although committed Globalists like to pretend that it does, because this makes their ideological program seem “inevitable”), but to a Utopian ideology stating that erasing all national cultures and states (especially Western ones) is a positive good which should be promoted at all costs. Opposition to this should be banned as “discrimination,” “racism” and “nationalism” (the terms are used as synonyms).

I’ve engaged in long discussions as to whether or not our current weakness is caused by deeper-lying, structural flaws in our civilization or whether it is promoted by certain powerful groups with a dangerous agenda. My answer is that it is both. The ideology of Globalism is indeed promoted by certain elite groups much more than by the average citizen, and these ideas are enforced from above. This is happening all over the Western world, but it is particularly dangerous in Western Europe because of the legislative powers of the EU.

Although Leftists tend to be more aggressive, perhaps the dividing line in the internal struggle in the West is less between Left and Right and more between those who value national sovereignty and European culture and those who do not. Upholding borders has become more important in the age of globalization, not less. We need to reclaim control over our borders and reject any organization, either the EU, the UN, various human rights groups or others who prevent us from doing this. We must remind our political leaders that we pay national taxes because they are supposed to uphold our national borders. If they can't do so, we should no longer be required to pay taxes. National taxes, national borders could become a new rallying cry.

There are both left-wing and right-wing Globalists. They have different agendas, for instance with left-wing Globalists putting emphasis on silencing free speech and promoting "international law" through the United Nations and similar organizations, while right-wing Globalists concentrate more on the free flow of people across borders, just as they want free flow of goods and capital across borders. The Presidential election campaign in the USA in 2008 between Obama and McCain is a race between a left-wing and a right-wing Globalist. Both want open borders, if only for slightly different reasons, and tend to think of countries as ideas, not as entities populated by distinct peoples with shared values and a common history.

An ideological "war within the West" has paved the way for a physical "war against the West" waged by Islamic Jihadists, who correctly view our acceptance of Muslim immigration as a sign of weakness. Perhaps we will need to resolve the war within the West before we can win the war against the West. When Europeans such as Polish king Jan III Sobieski led their troops to victory over the Turks in the 1683 Battle of Vienna, they fought *for* a number of things: Their country, their culture and their religion. People don't just need to live; they need something to live for, and fight for.

We are against Islam. What are we for? I would suggest that one thing we should fight for is national sovereignty and the right to preserve our culture and pass it on to future generations. We are fighting for the right to define our own laws and national policies, not to be held hostage by the United Nations, unaccountable NGOs, transnational progressives or self-appointed guardians of the truth.

At the beginning of the 21st century, the West is the sick man of the world. We provide our sworn enemies with the technology and medicine to multiply, give them the transportation and legal rights to move to our countries (after showing them through TV and movies how much better life is in our part of the world). On top of this, we pay them to colonize our countries and harass our children while our leaders ban opposition to this as intolerance, discrimination and racism. When did the West stop thinking? Where did we go wrong? Here is the answer an American friend of mine gave:

"Well, there's Marxism of course, which was extremely damaging in all its forms. There were the two world wars which killed so many of our people and caused a lack of cultural confidence. Then there was the Pax Americana and the unprecedented safety and affluence it brought to the Western World. We have now had two generations of Westerners, almost three, who have never known real poverty, hunger, war, or 'the knock on the door in the middle of the night.' Without a need for survival skills, we had the time and the money to focus on ever-more insane political and cultural ideologies...I think I remember reading something about how the Indian Hindu empires became ripe for conquest by Islam — 'They focused on becoming good, instead of remaining powerful.' I can't remember the source on that though. But that's what we are now — obsessing about how to be good, not on being powerful. And our 'goodness' isn't worth much if the rest of the world is focused on becoming powerful. Also, you have to remember, a lot of people are making money out of these insane ideologies. The 'diversity' industry in the U.S. is worth billions — people with little skills or ability are being given comfy well-paid jobs because of it....And because of anti-discrimination laws, every organization, whether for profit or not, must have a 'diversity' plan to point to if they ever get sued for 'discrimination.' It's literally a recession-proof captive industry. Anyways we're sick and the whole world knows it. They are coming here to feed off our sickness."

The West is rapidly declining as a percentage of world population and in danger of being overwhelmed by immigration from poorer countries with booming populations. People of European origins need to adjust our self-image correspondingly and ditch the current ideology of deranged altruism. We are not all-powerful and are not in a position to help everybody in developing countries out of poverty, certainly not by allowing them to move here. We need to develop a new mental paradigm dedicated to our own survival.



We should take a break from mass immigration in general. Any future immigration needs to be strictly controlled and exclusively non-Muslim. This break should be used to demonstrate clearly that the West will no longer serve as the dumping ground for excess population growth in other countries. We have cultures that we'd like to preserve, too, and cannot and should not be expected to accept unlimited number of migrants from other countries.

In my view, the best way to deal with the Islamic world is to have as little to do with it as possible. We should completely stop and if necessary ban Muslim immigration. This could be done in creative and indirect ways, such as banning immigration from nations with citizens known to be engaged in terrorist activities. We should remove all Muslim non-citizens currently in the West and change our laws to ensure that Muslim citizens who advocate sharia, preach Jihad, the inequality of "infidels" and of women should have their citizenship revoked and be deported back to their country of origin.

We need to create an environment where the practice of Islam is made difficult. Much of this can be done in non-discriminatory ways, by simply refusing to allow special pleading to Muslims. Do not allow the Islamic public call to prayer as it is offensive to other faiths. Boys and girls should take part in all sporting and social activities of the school and the community. The veil should be banned in all public institutions, thus contributing to breaking the traditional subjugation of women. Companies and public buildings should not be forced to build prayer rooms for Muslims. Enact laws to eliminate the abuse of family reunification laws. Do not permit major investments by Muslims in Western media or universities.

American columnist [Diana West](#) wants us to shift from a pro-democracy offensive to an anti-sharia defensive. Calling this a "War on Terror" as President George W. Bush did in 2001 was a mistake. Baron Bodissey of the Gates of Vienna blog has suggested the slogan "Take Back the Culture," thus focusing on our internal struggle for traditional European culture.

People should be educated about the realities of Jihad and sharia. Educating non-Muslims about Islam is more important than educating Muslims, but we should do both. Groups of dedicated individuals should engage in efforts to explain the real nature of Islam, emphasizing the division that Islam teaches between Believer and Infidel, the permanent state of war between Dar al-Islam and Dar al-Harb and the use of taqiyya and kitman, religious deception.

As [Hugh Fitzgerald of Jihad Watch](#) says, we should explain why Islam encourages despotism (because allegiance is owed the ruler as long as he is a Muslim), economic paralysis, intellectual failure (the cult of authority, the hostility to free and skeptical inquiry) in Islamic countries. Let Muslims themselves begin slowly to understand that all of their political, economic, social, intellectual, and moral failures are a result of Islamic teachings.

Fitzgerald also suggests exploiting the many fissures within the Islamic world: Divide and conquer. Divide and demoralize. Islam has universalist claims but it talks about Arabs as the "best of peoples," and has been a vehicle for Arab supremacy, to promote Arab conquest of wealthier non-Arab populations. In addition to divisions between Arabs and non-Arab Muslims, we have the sectarian divide between Shias and Sunnis, and the economic division between the fabulously rich oil-and-natural-gas Arab states and the poor Muslim countries.

Both the sectarian and economic divisions within Islam are best exploited by infidels doing nothing. If the Western world stops giving Egypt, Pakistan, Jordan, and the Palestinians "aid," which has in reality become a disguised form of jizya, this will clear the psychological air. And it will force the poorer Arabs and other Muslims to go to the rich Arabs for support.

Right now, Muslims can enjoy the best of both worlds, and follow primitive religious laws while enjoying the fruits of 21st century civilization. We need to drive home the utter failure of the Islamic model by making sure that Muslims should no longer be able to count on permanent Western or infidel aid in their overpopulated, self-primitivized states, whose very unviability they are prevented from recognizing by this constant infusion of aid.

We need to deprive Muslims as much as possible of Western jizya in other forms, which means ending foreign aid, but also institute a Manhattan Project for alternative sources of energy, in order to become independent of Arab oil.

As Mr. Fitzgerald asks: “What would the rich Arabs do if the Western world decided to seize their property in the West as the assets of enemy aliens, just as was done to the property owned not only by the German government, but by individual Germans, during World War II? And what would they do if they were to be permanently deprived of easy access to Western medical care?”

We must reject the “You turn into what you fight” argument. Those who fought the Nazis didn’t become Nazis during the Second World War. The truth is, we will become like Muslims if we *don’t* stand up to them and keep them out of our countries, otherwise they will subdue us and Islamize us by force. The West isn’t feared because we are “oppressors,” we are despised because we are perceived as weak and decadent. Jihadist websites have said that China is not the enemy at the moment. China, too, is an infidel enemy, but Muslims respect the Chinese more than Western nations. We can live with having enemies. The important thing is making sure that our enemies respect us, as Machiavelli indicated in *The Prince*.

We should implement a policy of containment of the Islamic world, but for this to work we will sometimes have to take military action to crush Muslim pretensions to grandeur. The Buddhists of Central Asia undoubtedly held the “moral high ground” in relations to Muslims. They are all dead now. At the very least, we must be prepared to back up our ideological defenses with force on certain occasions.

Several objections could be raised against the containment option. Some claim that it is too harsh and thus won’t be implemented; others say that it is insufficient and won’t work in the long run. It’s true that in the current political climate, expulsion of sharia-sponsoring Muslims isn’t going to happen, but the current ruling paradigm won’t last. It is likely that we will get civil wars in several Western countries because of the ongoing mass immigration. This will finally demonstrate how serious the situation is and force other Western nations to act.

I have heard comments that it isn’t practically doable to contain the Islamic world behind some artificial Maginot Line. When the Mongols could simply go around the Great Wall of China in the thirteenth century, it will be impossible to contain anybody in an age of modern communication technology. No, it won’t be easy, but we should at least try. Containment isn’t necessarily the only thing we need to do, just the very minimum that is acceptable. Perhaps the spread of nuclear technology will indeed trigger a large-scale war with the Islamic world at some point. The only way to prevent this is to take steps, including military ones, to deprive Muslims of dangerous technology. Jihad is waged by military, political, financial, demographic and diplomatic means. The defense against Jihad has to be equally diverse.

In the post What Can We Do?, Gates of Vienna republished an essay by reader Westerner which was originally posted at American writer Lawrence Auster’s website. Westerner argues that the separationist policy proposed by Auster and others of rolling back, containing, and using military force to quarantine Muslims would not be sufficient to make the non-Islamic world safe, because Islamic regimes would still exist and continue to seek ways to harm us. He therefore proposes a policy aimed at crushing Islam.

Nevertheless, my general policy recommendation is to advocate separation and containment. The crucial point is to stress that **Islam cannot be reformed nor reconciled with our way of life**. There is no moderate Islam. There can be moderate Muslims, but they can turn into Jihadists tomorrow or they can lie to deceive the infidels, which is widely practiced in Islam. There is no way for us to know. Those who want to understand this can read my online essay about “moderate Islam” as well as the essay “Why We Cannot Rely on Moderate Muslims.”

According to blogger Conservative Swede, “In fact it is easier to argue for a stop of ALL immigration, to the general public, than a specific stop of Muslim immigration (maybe not in America, but surely in Sweden and the rest of Europe). People simply know very little about Islam. They need to be educated first, and already that is a big effort. So this is the first step. Before this has been achieved, before the awareness about the true face of Islam is firmly represented among the general public, it becomes pointless to push for deportation of all Muslims at the arenas directed at the general public. The first and current step is about educating people about Islam.” He puts emphasis on the need for breaking the spirit of our Jihadist enemies and finding ways of symbolically defeating them.

I have been criticized because my talk about containment and the need to limit even non-Muslim immigration

smacks of the siege mentality of a friendless West. Advocating a policy of much stricter immigration control in general isn't based on isolationism, it's based on realism. We're in the middle of the largest migration waves in human history. The simple fact is that far more people want to live in the West than we can possibly let in. Technology has made it easier for people to settle in other countries, and easier for them to stay in touch with their original homeland as if they never left. We have to deal with this fact by slowing the immigration rates to assimilation levels; otherwise our societies will eventually break down.

I'm advocating isolation of the Islamic world, not of the West. Even if we cannot allow all non-Muslims to freely settle in our lands, this does not mean that they have to be our enemies. Jihad is being waged against the entire non-Muslim world, not just the West. We should stop trying to "win the hearts and minds" of Muslims instead cooperate with other non-Muslims. It is important to stress here, however, that this cooperation should be based on mutually shared strategic interests, not on a Western mission to "save the world."

We live in a world demographically — and perhaps soon economically — dominated by Asians, yet too many Westerners are still mentally stuck in an age where we had a dominant position. The Chinese look after Chinese interests, Indians after Indian interests, etc. This is how it should be. Only Westerners are supposed to worry about global interests. We should stop trying to save others and start saving ourselves, while we still can. Only by letting go of illusions of hegemony can we regain our sanity. The Western world order is dead. The sooner we realize that, the better are our chances. Instead of complaining about "decline" we could use this situation as an opportunity to define a new civilizational mission dedicated to our own survival. If cultural confusion is a cause of our low birth rates, it is possible that a new sense of purpose could lead to a rise in birth rates. The battle for Western hegemony is already over. The battle for Western survival is about to begin.

As I have pointed out several times in my essays, Islam is a secondary infection which feeds off our weakness. Muslims would never have been able to challenge us as much as they do now without finding willing collaborators within our ranks who viewed them as potential allies in the fight against their own civilization. Many immigrants are tools for our elites as well, a protected class being used as a battering ram for the "creative destruction" of established Western nation states. The groups that hate our civilization the most, along with Jihadist Muslims, are white Marxists, while some of the people who defend it are immigrants who were not born into it. We thus face the possibly unique situation of a civilization being attacked by insiders and defended by people who were not born into it.

We need to keep our eyes on the ball. Imagine if you have a zebra in a cage. A social engineer comes up with the brilliant idea that we now live in the age of globalization and that all creatures therefore have to learn to live together in harmony. If they refuse, they should be forced to participate in this noble project under the enlightened guidance of educated social engineers. The zebra is forced to share his cage with a lion. When he tries to protest, the social engineers tell him that he is an evil racist who suffers from lionophobia, which is promptly banned by law. Young zebras are taught through the education system and the media to feel weighed down by guilt because lions have suffered much injustice in the past. They are consequently prevented from identifying threats and responding to them in a sensible manner.

The experiment ends badly and many zebras are slaughtered. The question is: Who are really the bad guys in this case? I would blame the social engineers more than the lions. If a lion kills a zebra, he is only following his nature. Similarly, it is in Islam's nature to attack others. If Muslims follow Islam's nature, why should we be surprised? After all, they have been doing this for 1400 years. Yes, we should be angry with them, but we should first and foremost be angry with those who fed us false information, flooded our countries with enemies and forced us to live with them. They constitute enemy number one. We should never forget that. This analogy is not perfect since we are not dealing with animals but with human beings who can think for themselves. Nevertheless, we need to keep this in mind.

I believe we need to think of two distinct fights: The fight for the West and for European civilization, and the fight against Islam. They overlap on a number of occasions, but they are by no means identical. Moreover, just because Muslim immigration is uniquely harmful doesn't mean that all other forms of mass immigration are unproblematic. Personally, I have two goals, listed here according to their relative importance:

1. Defend European civilization and the peoples who have historically created it

## 2. Fight Islam on a global basis

For my part, I have always, and will always, support priority number two, **as long as this doesn't conflict with priority number one**. I will be happy to help Hindus in India or Buddhists in Thailand in the fight against Jihad, but that doesn't mean that I will allow unlimited numbers of Asians settle in my country. This would spell the end of my nation, and that would obviously conflict with goal number one. There is a school of thought which says that it's bad if native Europeans are displaced by Muslims, but OK if we are displaced by others. I would prefer not to be displaced by anybody. The defense of European civilization, which is what Western civilization actually is, is inseparable from the defense of the peoples who have historically created it. And no, we are not "socially constructed."

The United Nations is heavily infiltrated by Islamic groups. We should starve it for funds and ridicule it at any given opportunity. As an alternative to the UN, we could create an organization where only democratic states could become members. The most important principle at this point is to contain the Islamic world. We simply cannot allow our enemies to have influence over our policies, which they do through the UN.

Europeans need to totally dismantle the European Union and regain national control over our borders and legislation. The EU is so deeply flawed and infiltrated by pro-Islamic thinking that it simply cannot be reformed. No, the EU isn't the only problem we have, but it is the worst, and we can't fix our other problems as long as the EU is in charge. And let's end the stupid support for the Palestinians that the Eurabians have encouraged and start supporting our cultural cousin, Israel. Europe's first line of defense starts in Jerusalem.

Europeans should adopt legislation similar to the First and Second Amendments in the American Bill of Rights, securing the right to free speech and gun ownership. The reason why European authorities are becoming increasingly totalitarian in their censorship efforts is to conceal the fact that they are no longer willing or able to uphold even the most basic security of their citizenry, far less our national borders.

We need to ditch the welfare state, which is probably doomed anyway. The welfare state wasn't all bad, but it cannot compete in a world of billions of capitalists in low-cost countries. It creates a false sense of security in a dog-eat-dog world and breeds a passivity that is very dangerous in our struggle for survival. We should use the money to strengthen our border controls and rebuild credible militaries. Western Europeans have lived under Pax Americana for so long that we have forgotten how to defend ourselves. This needs to change, and soon.

I recently read the book The Shock Doctrine by the prominent left-wing intellectual Naomi Klein. That is, I made an attempt to read it. I gave up after a few chapters. Klein talks about how clean slate ideologies are dangerous, and mentions in passing some crimes committed by the Soviet regime and the criticism which followed its collapse. Then she says:

"The process has sparked heated debate around the world about how many of these atrocities stemmed from the ideology invoked, as opposed to its distortion by adherents like Stalin, Ceausescu, Mao and Pol Pot. 'It was flesh-and-blood Communism that imposed wholesale repression, culminating in a state-sponsored reign of terror,' writes Stéphane Courtois, co-author of the contentious Black Book of Communism. 'Is the ideology itself blameless?' Of course it is not. It doesn't follow that all forms of Communism are inherently genocidal, as some have gleefully claimed, but it was certainly an interpretation of Communist theory that was doctrinaire, authoritarian, and contemptuous of pluralism that led to Stalin's purges and to Mao's re-education camps. Authoritarian Communism is, and should be, forever tainted by those real-world laboratories. But what of the contemporary crusade to liberate world markets?"

Klein claims that not all forms of market systems have to be inherently violent. They can leave room for free health care, too. She condemns "authoritarian interpretations" of Communism, but not necessarily Communism as such. Exactly where we can find examples of non-authoritarian Communism she doesn't say. That's as far as self-criticism has progressed in the political Left a generation after we "defeated" Marxism.

The economist Milton Friedman, along with F. Hayek, is one of the villains of Naomi Klein's book. According to her, Friedman has stated that "only a crisis — actual or perceived — produces real change. When that crisis occurs, the actions that are taken depend on the ideas that are lying around. That, I believe, is our basic function: to develop alternatives to existing policies, to keep them alive and available until the politically impossible becomes politically inevitable." Friedman believes that during a crisis, we only have a brief window of opportunity before society slips back into the "tyranny of the status quo," and that we need to use this opportunity or lose it.

This is actually sound advice and in my view the strategy Western survivalists should follow. When I first started writing as Fjordman I focused on how to "fix the system." I've gradually come to the conclusion that the system cannot be fixed. Not only does it have too many enemies; it also contains too many internal contradictions. If we define the "system" as mass immigration from alien cultures, Globalism, Multiculturalism and suppression of free speech in the name of "tolerance," then this is going to collapse. It's inevitable.

The goal of European and Western survivalists — and that's what we are, it is our very survival that is at stake — should not be to "fix" the ideology of Multiculturalism but to be mentally prepared for its collapse, and to develop coherent answers to what went wrong and prepare to implement the necessary remedies when the time comes. We need to seize the window of opportunity, and in order to do so, we need to define clearly what we want to achieve. What went wrong with our civilization, and how can we survive and hopefully regenerate, despite being an increasingly vulnerable minority in an often hostile world?

If or when the European Union collapses, we need to stage trials against the creators of Eurabia and denounce the lies told by our media and academia. Their ideology needs to be exposed as evil. The political elites implement the agendas of our enemies and ignore the interests of their people. Change will come when they fear the consequences of their betrayal more than they fear Muslims. We need to regain control over our national borders and legislation, and we need to reclaim control over the media. Those who control the media, control society.

It is easy to blame others, but we have to accept responsibility for our situation. Yes, we have indeed been betrayed by our leaders, but that's only part of the problem. People tend to get the governments they deserve. Maybe we get weak leaders because we are weak, or because they can exploit weaknesses in our mentality to get us where they want; anti-Americanism, anti-Semitism, our excessive desire for consensus and suppression of dissent, the anti-individualistic legacy from Socialism and the passivity bred by welfare state bureaucracy. Muslims are stuck with their problems and blame everybody else for their failures because they can never admit they are caused by deep flaws in their culture. We shouldn't make the same mistake. Europeans export wine; Arabs export whine. That's the way it should be.

In his book *The River War* published in 1899, Winston Churchill wrote about the cursed effects of Mohammedanism (which is what Islam is):

"The effects are apparent in many countries. Improvident habits, slovenly systems of agriculture, sluggish methods of commerce, and insecurity of property exist wherever the followers of the Prophet rule or live. A degraded sensualism deprives this life of its grace and refinement; the next of its dignity and sanctity. The fact that in Mohammedan law every woman must belong to some man as his absolute property, either as a child, a wife, or a concubine, must delay the final extinction of slavery until the faith of Islam has ceased to be a great power among men. Individual Moslems may show splendid qualities — but the influence of the religion paralyses the social development of those who follow it. No stronger retrograde force exists in the world. Far from being moribund, Mohammedanism is a militant and proselytizing faith. It has already spread throughout Central Africa, raising fearless warriors at every step; and were it not that Christianity is sheltered in the strong arms of science, the science against which it had vainly struggled, the civilisation of modern Europe might fall, as fell the civilisation of ancient Rome."



This description remains correct today. Nevertheless, bad as it is, Islam isn't the cause of our current weakness. In addition to plain decadence, there is a widespread feeling in much of Europe that nothing is worth fighting for, certainly not through armed struggle. There are no Great Truths, everything is equal. Maybe Europe's faith in itself died in Auschwitz, but it was severely wounded in the trenches of the First World War. It was WW1 that radicalized Europe, triggered the Russian Revolution and the rise of Soviet Communism, and filled Germany, including a young corporal named Adolf Hitler, with a desire for vengeance and much of the ammunition they needed for their rise to power in the 1930s.

I have heard claims that European civilization will not survive the twenty-first century. A century is a very long time, we should remember that. Would anybody (except a Churchill) in the early twentieth century, when Europe was strong, have predicted that it would now be in the process of being overpowered by Algerians and Pakistanis? Things change. They can change for the worse, but also for the better. Our ancestors, better men and women than we are, held the line against Islam for more than one thousand years, sacrificing their blood for the continent. By doing so, they not only preserved the European heartland and thus Western civilization itself, but quite possibly the world in general from Islamic dominance. The stakes involved now are no less than they were then, possibly even greater.

It is difficult to predict the future, apart from the fact that there will be a lot of turbulence. As American scholar [Daniel Pipes](#) puts it, the decisive events have yet to take place, perhaps within the next decade or so. The situation is historically unprecedented: "No large territory has ever shifted from one civilization to another by virtue of a collapsed population, faith, and identity; nor has a people risen on so grand a scale to reclaim its patrimony. The novelty and magnitude of Europe's predicament make it difficult to understand, tempting to overlook, and nearly impossible to predict. Europe marches us all into terra incognita."

Some people claim that Europe isn't worth fighting for and that many people here deserve what's coming. Some of them probably do, yes. The catch is that the people who deserve most to be punished for the current mess are the ones who are least likely to pay the price. The creators of Eurabia will be the first to flee the continent when the going gets tough, leaving those who have never heard of Eurabia and never approved of its creation to fight.

Edmund Burke believed that if a society can be seen as a contract, we must recognize that most parties to the contract are either dead or not yet born. I like that idea, which means that when you fight for a country, you don't just fight for the ones that are there now, but for those who lived there before and for those who will live there in the future. If we don't want to fight for what Europe is today then let us fight for what it once was, and maybe, just maybe, for what it may become once more. There was real greatness in this continent once. It seems a long time ago now, but we can get there again. Meanwhile, let us work to ensure the survival of European civilization, which is now very much in question.